THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, B.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XI NOVEMBER, 1925 No. 65

EDITORIAL

THE PRAYERS OF THE SAINTS

There are many to whom the Festival of All Saints, with its sequel of All Souls' Day, is one of the sweetest days in the calendar. The Church's year is drawing to its close; the great events of history from which the Christian dispensation takes its beginning have been commemorated; and as we prepare again for the solemn trumpet-call of Advent, our hearts are caught up as in a rhapsody of the spirit to the mighty interchange of prayer and praise which is the perpetual groundwork of the Church's life. One side of this interchange—our prayer for the departed—has been so widely recovered amongst us that it is hard to realize the prejudices which had to be overcome; and its inclusion in our liturgical services is no longer a matter of serious controversy. It is the other side of the interchange—the intercession of the saints for us—which to-day presents difficulties and calls for careful thought and judgment.

Various causes make the subject one of great importance. The Church's doctrine of the departed, and the devotional practices which embody it, are our great defence against the darker forces of spiritualism; and the vitality of these forces since the war is a reminder of how much has been lacking in out witness. The fact that a philosopher of the standing of Mr. C. D. Broad should in a large work of technical philosophy admit spiritualistic phenomena as providing important evidences for the true nature of man's soul is something of a portent; and we cannot be content much longer to leave the Church's attitude towards the departed to the vagaries of individual opinion. And stronger even than the needs of apologetic are those of the Church's practical life and warfare. Few features in the Anglo-Catholic congresses of recent years have been more vibrant with spiritual challenge than the recitation of the Hail Mary. Leaving aside for the moment its doctrinal aspects,

its psychological effect has been immense. It is the effect wrought upon an army, when reinforcements are suddenly thrown in on its side from an unexpected quarter. It has brought the sense of numbers, and the strength which that sense means for *morale*. It has opened our eyes to the fact that "they that be with us are more than they that be with them," and that the victory of the Cross is certain. None who have invoked this fellowship with the Church beyond the grave, and have realized the warmth and power which it brings to prayer and effort, can go back from it. The question is how it is rightly to be expressed.

From early times Christians have believed that the Church on earth was fortified by the intercessions of the dead. No allusion to the belief, it is true, is to be found in the New Testament: the phrase in the Apocalypse, "the prayers of the saints," refers in all probability to the Church militant.* But it is a deduction which was bound to be drawn sooner or later from our Lord's teaching. God "is not a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto Him." And this life, as it is richer than that here and nearer to Christ,† must assuredly be more full of love, and so of prayer. We cannot think of those whose very breath while on earth was intercession except as employing that same activity above in ever ampler measure and with keener fire. And it is reasonable, further, to connect the prayers of the saints—whether we interpret this last word in its original New Testament sense, or in its later ecclesiastical signification—with the intercessions of the Holy Spirit, of which St. Paul speaks so plainly (Rom. viii. 27). For the saints are precisely all those whom the Holy Ghost sanctifies, the living witnesses of His power, and organs of His operation in the world. We realize His mighty intercession whenever we think of the Church on earth at prayer; we realize it still more richly when we extend our vision to embrace the Church in Paradise.

This is the belief which was expressed with such fervour by the Fathers, and by none more so than by Origen. None will accuse Origen of indifference to truth or of incautious or uncritical statement; and his repeated emphasis on the prayers of the saints betokens evidently an important element of his own devotional life.‡ And it has been an element in Catholic life ever since, voiced alike in the considered teachings of theologians and in such inscriptions as that on a child's grave in the third century, "Pray for thy parents." There is, indeed,

* Yet Rev. vi. 9 *ff.* is to the point on the other side. † 2 Cor. v.

‡ *Cf.* Swete, *The Holy Catholic Church*, p. 222.

no question as to its authority. But when we pass from the belief to its expression in devotional forms we are at once on more debatable ground.

For it cannot be denied that the custom of directly asking the saints for their prayers, which grew apace from the fourth century onwards, and by the eighth century had found a place in the Church's litanies, is open to very serious objections. On the theological side, it appears to involve ascribing a knowledge to the saints which is not easily attributable to human minds; while, practically, experience seems to show that it is almost impossible to prevent requests to the saints for their prayers becoming requests to them for benefits of grace. And this fact of experience is important. If it be argued—and precisely in so far as it is argued—that experience has proved the spiritual value of direct invocation of saints, then this counter-fact of experience, the danger of a virtual polytheism,* needs to be equally faced. The one is as much a fact of religious experience as the other.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the Church of England should have taken a strong line at the Reformation; and though it is not certain that Article XXII. condemns the doctrine of invocation in its Tridentine form, sober and Catholic scholars such as Prebendary Bicknell incline to the view that it does so.† Be that as it may, the practice of invocation of saints virtually ceased to be practised in the English Church. For a few—for those, that is, who by their own native wit knew how to translate beliefs into prayers—its place was taken by comprecation. For the great majority of Church folk, fellowship with the saints remained an article of faith, but not a conscious fact of prayer.

Many would be content to leave matters there; but for our own part we are not. One of the most serious features in the Catholic movement at the present time is what we will venture to call its two-storey organization—its tendency, we mean, to let head and heart function independently, with the same kind of courteous charity between the two as one finds between the inhabitants of flats on the same staircase. It is time that theology and popular devotion ceased to meet on the staircase, and went into one another's apartments. Theology has got to recognize that popular devotion has an uncanny *flair* for method: it knows psychology by intuition; it is a master of

* M. Saintyves' *Les Saints Successeurs de Dieux* gives an instructive statement of the case from the non-Christian standpoint.

† *A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles*, 2nd edition, p. 368. We are glad to note that this excellent book is already in its second edition. Art. XXII. is earlier than the relevant Tridentine decree, but was unaltered in the revision of 1571, after the Roman doctrine had been officially promulgated.

technique. The reason why people love the Hail Mary is that it puts in a nutshell something they want to express. And by the like token popular devotion has got to admit the claims of theology to safeguard truth of doctrine. The great tragedy of mediævalism, as Creighton used to insist, was that those claims were neither adequately asserted by the one nor conceded by the other; and the result was the further tragedies of the Reformation.

Among those who feel the necessity, for their own life as well as for others, of some concise devotional acts expressive of belief in the prayers of the saints for us, two lines of policy seem possible. One is that adopted in the *Bishop's Book* of Henry VIII.'s reign, and recently advocated by a Bampton Lecturer:*

> The practice of asking the saints now with Christ for their prayers, a practice which the Council of Trent too feebly safeguarded against the recrudescence of grave abuses, became almost entirely abandoned in all countries where the Reformation prevailed. This abandonment formed no part of the original English Reformation. And if these requests for the prayers of Christ's friends had been maintained, together with prayers for the faithful departed, within the limits laid down by our Church in the time of Henry VIII., less injury would have been done to the doctrine of the communion of saints and less stimulus would have been given to the unwholesome necromancy which has led so many dupes from the medium to the madhouse.

We cannot imagine the case for the *Ora pro nobis* better put. And we can go on to imagine a defence for it which was not so fragile as the defences put forward of old. Modern investigation of telepathy, for example, appears to render it probable that transference of thought is possible from A to B, even when they do not know one another, provided that A has previously known *about* B, and that there is some common object of interest or affection to serve as a link between them: and it is to be observed that it is precisely this hypothesis which renders the spiritistic interpretation of psychic phenomena unnecessary. Yet many will feel that such a defence is very speculative, and offers no real safeguard against abuse.

The alternative policy would aim at a revision of the devotional *formulæ* themselves. Let us take the Hail Mary, which is the natural norm of all others. How far from faultless it is in its English dress! A Greek scholar can scarcely allow that "Mother of God" is a satisfactory rendering of *Theotokos*. And do we do well to think of her in isolation

* Dr. Leighton Pullan, *Religion Since the Reformation*, p. 69.

from the whole body of the saints? Or is she not rather the first and chief of all those who are on the manward, not the Godward, side of redemption—redeemed and not redeemer? Here, no doubt, the Modernist, who says that there is no real distinction between the human and the divine, would be found—if he were logical—in the same camp with Alfonso da Liguori. On this score, at least, the Eastern custom of invoking all the departed, and not the canonized alone, seems far safer and less liable to abuse.

Such considerations would appear to point to an amended form of the Hail Mary. There will still be the greeting to her who was uniquely the organ of our salvation and, with her, to all the invisible company of the blessed; still the memorial of the Incarnation; still the actualization in prayer of the belief that the saints aid us by their intercessions.

Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women: blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus.

May Holy Mary and all saints pray for us now and at the hour of our death.

Some will say that such an amended form could never replace that which in a score of ways has become familiar. Who can say? As the history of the *Gloria* indicates, fashions in popular devotions are strange things; and if some *jongleur de Dieu* should come along and make the new form his own—if new it is—it would be reckoned within a generation to have the hall-mark of immemorial authority.

But, whatever form we adopt, the important thing is that we should not omit to avail ourselves of the intercessions of the saints in our Christion warfare

---

WHAT IS THE GOSPEL?*

WE have thought of the Gospel which the Lord preached to the multitudes of the people of God. It was, we saw, a Gospel more elementary than the Gospel which is ours to-day. It was the Gospel of the kingdom rather than the Gospel of the King; the Gospel of the Father, as Harnack says, rather than the Gospel of the Son, if by that we mean, not just the Gospel of the Divine Fatherhood, but the Gospel of the Father as offering the blessing of His rule to the people of His choice, and calling them to repentance and faith. But I expect that many of you were inclined to say that our Lord taught far more than this; and that though no doubt He said more to His disciples than He said to the crowd, the crowd itself must have felt that our Lord was far more than the messenger of another. He stood to the kingdom which He proclaimed in a far closer relation than the Baptist had stood; somehow the kingdom was bound up with Himself and with adherence to Him; and though He might not, as far as words went, claim to be the expected Christ, the question could not but arise whether He was not He. That Jesus was the Christ was the very centre of the Apostolic Gospel; and was it not really the Gospel of the Lord Himself? Very unlike He was in some ways to the expected Deliverer. The dominion of Rome seemed not to trouble Him. He sought to conceal His miracles rather than to publish them; and, when men wished to make Him a king, He went off by Himself into the hills. And yet—by His miracles especially—was He not doing just what the Messiah was to do, not merely proclaiming, but bringing the kingdom of God? It is to this question that we shall turn to-day, and the answer which I shall suggest is this. Our Lord did by His action and bearing suggest this question, and He intended to suggest it. But with the crowd He never faced the issue till He rode into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday, and even then the cry, though not the only cry, was "This is the prophet Jesus, from Nazareth of Galilee." With the chosen few, however, it was otherwise. He was continually preparing them to preach a larger Gospel than He had preached Himself; and this Gospel was to be the Gospel of the Messianic King as well as the Gospel of the kingdom. Indeed, it was to be more even than this. It was to be the Gospel of redemption, and the Gospel of the Holy Ghost. But not even to the few could all be made plain till the Lord had died, and been glorified, and sent the Holy Ghost. He had many things to say unto them, but they

* These articles comprise the substance of lectures delivered by Professor Goudge at the Oxford Summer School for Clergy in July, 1925.

could not bear them yet. When we go outside the Gospel of the kingdom, what we see is not so much the Lord preaching the Gospel, but the Lord preparing others to preach it. There are three points with which we shall deal. The first is the Christship of the Lord; the second is His redemptive activity; the third is the gift of the Holy Ghost.

I

We turn, then, to the Christship of the Lord, as He revealed it to His disciples; but just a word more of the crowd before we leave them. That our Lord never publicly claimed to be the Christ till the last week of His life seems quite clear. This conclusion does not rest upon the argument from silence; we have definite facts. We read, *e.g.*, that, when the demoniacs spoke of His Christship, the Lord silenced them (Mark i. 34). Whether the demoniacs, or their "controls," did know Him is a question upon which we need not enter; perhaps, as with mediums to-day, the apparent knowledge exhibited was due to thought-transference from one mind to another; the point to notice is the care taken by our Lord to conceal His real position. The same thing is apparent when the disciples themselves attained to faith in His Messiahship. "Then charged He the disciples that they should tell no man that He was the Christ" (Matt. xvi. 20). Nothing can be plainer than such statements as these. The opposite view arises, I would suggest, from two things. The one is that the Gospels chiefly relate what the Lord said to those who were already His disciples, and not what He said to the crowd; the other is that the Fourth Gospel seems to us to teach that our Lord publicly claimed to be the Messiah from the first. But, quite apart from the difficulties which are attached to our Lord's discourses in the Fourth Gospel, it is more than doubtful whether it teaches this. The very early confessions of our Lord's Christship, which we find in the first chapter, appear as due, not to the Lord's teaching, but to the proclamation of the Baptist of the great one to follow him, and his witness to Jesus as the Lamb of God. The Christship, in which faith is expressed, is almost certainly one of the nationalistic kind which the Lord would have disclaimed, and He receives the confessions without enthusiasm. On the other hand, our Lord is never found declaring that He is the Christ outside His own circle, except once with the Samaritan woman, whose conception of Christship was of a different character; and we find the crowd complaining of our Lord's reserve, even far on in His ministry. "How long dost Thou hold us in suspense? If Thou art the Christ, tell us plainly" (John x. 24). We may then conclude that the Christship of the Lord was no part of the Gospel which

He Himself preached to the crowd, and that we are here simply concerned with the way in which He led the Apostles to preach it after Him.

What was the meaning of the title the Messiah, or the Christ? If the Lord could not accept it in the nationalistic sense, in what sense could He accept it? The word means "anointed"; and prophets, priests, and kings all were, or might be, anointed for their work. But it was the king, rather than the prophet or the priest, that was normally regarded as "the Lord's anointed"; and the Messiah was generally regarded as a King to arise from the House of David. In the Old Testament the Messiah is not so prominent as popular teaching has led us to suppose; it is Yahweh, the God of Israel, who is the great expected Deliverer; the Messiah is an instrument of Yahweh, whom some prophets suppose that He will employ, while some are silent about him altogether. But two things may be said about the Christ, and both are important. The first is that the Christ is always the bringer of a corporate, not of an individual salvation. If it is said that He comes to "save His people from their sins," the word "people" is here a collective word; and to save them from their sins probably means quite as much to save them from the evil conditions which their sins have brought as to save them from the sins themselves. The second is that the thought of the Christ is in the closest connection with the thought of the kingdom. He comes to overthrow all that hinders that kingdom, to restore Israel to the divine sovereignty, and to reign over it in His name, the Head and Centre of it. He comes, in a word, to rebuild and rule over the Church of God. He stands in the Old Testament from first to last in the closest relation to Yahweh Himself, His Son—by adoption, if in no higher sense—through whom He acts. God's people and Church are thus the Christ's people and Church; and when our Lord says, speaking of the faithful remnant, "On this rock I will build My Church," He uses language which is entirely intelligible on the lips of the Christ. That is what "the Christ" means—the Redeemer, Restorer, Re-Builder under God of the Church or people of God; and it became possible for the Lord to claim the title without arousing false expectations when, and only when, His followers had reached some insight into His character and methods, and into the character of the kingdom which He proclaimed. That Jesus is the Christ is, I should maintain, the central dogma of Christianity. One who believes Jesus to be the Christ is a Christian; one who regards Him in any lesser way is not a Christian yet, though he may be in heart and life much nearer to Him than many who possess, or believe themselves to possess, a higher faith.

Now it was the close and vital connection of Jesus of Nazareth

with the Kingdom of God which was, I would suggest, the main element in bringing the Apostles to believe that He was the Christ. That He proclaimed the coming of the Kingdom would not in itself suggest it; but that He wielded, as He did, the powers of the Kingdom suggested it strongly; and so did the relation in which He was found to stand to God. "Art Thou He that should come, or do we look for another?" (Matt. xi. 2-6). So the Baptist asked from his prison. The Lord did not answer the question directly; our faith must be our own; but He pointed to the facts that might enable the Baptist to answer it for himself. "Go your way and tell John the things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good tidings preached to them." The point is that the blessings bestowed are the blessings of the Kingdom, and the natural signs of the presence of the Christ. So with the Lord's personal relation to the Father. "All things have been delivered unto Me of My Father; and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him." Our Lord, I believe, here speaks of Himself primarily in relation to the revelation which He brings; the "all things" that are delivered unto Him are the "all things" of the divine message. But what a claim lies behind! It is not just that He alone knows the Father, presumptuous as such a claim might be in any one else; it is that only the Father knows Him, and Who He really is. It is this profound union with the Father which is the real source of the authority with which the Lord speaks. He says this plainly and repeatedly in the Fourth Gospel, but it is surely apparent in all. For those who have come really close to Him it is impossible to regard Him merely as a prophet. The word of God never "comes to Him," because it is never absent from Him. In Him God is always speaking; His word is the Father's word, and the Father's word His; and it is precisely when He most disclaims originality that He makes the highest claim. It has often been noticed that while the prophets use the formula "Thus saith Yahweh," the Lord's language is "Verily, verily, I say unto you." It is not that He claims an authority which the prophets did not claim, for higher authority than God's there cannot be. It is that, while the prophets of the Old Testament know the difference between speaking in their own name, and speaking in God's, since they sometimes do the one, and sometimes the other, our Lord knows no such difference. The most completely personal and individual expression which He can give to the truth is, none the less, the exact expression of the mind of God.

But it is not only implicitly in act and word that the claim to be the Christ appears; it appears more directly also. He speaks of His coming as a thing of profound significance for the world: "Blessed are your eyes, for they see; and your ears, for they hear. For verily I say unto you, that many prophets and righteous men desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not; and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not" (Matt. xiii. 16, 17). His coming fulfils the agelong purpose of God. There is present in Him something—the neuter is, I think, significant—greater than the temple, greater than Jonah the prophet and Solomon the king (Matt. xii. 6, 41, 42). He will call men to leave all at a moment's notice; He must come before father and mother, before wife and child. He does not, like the Baptist, sink Himself in His message: men are to believe in Him, and not merely in His message (Mark ix. 42); they are not to be ashamed of Him, and not merely of His words (Mark viii. 38). The place of men at the judgment will depend upon how they stand with Him. Indeed, it is He Who will exercise the judgment. "Many will say to Me on that day, Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by Thy Name, and by Thy Name cast out demons, and by Thy Name do many mighty works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from Me, ye that work iniquity." We may think that some of these words go beyond what even Christship can explain; the Sonship which the Messiah was expected to possess was but adoptive, and our Lord surely claims, even in the Synoptic Gospels, to be "the Son," in a sense too high for adoption to explain it. But, be this as it may, we can understand how, in spite of all His unlikeness to what had been expected, those who had eyes to see, and ears to hear, came to say "Thou art the Christ"; and how, when the Lord had ascended and they were called to proclaim the Gospel in His Name, they knew that, though the coming of the Kingdom was the first Article of the Gospel, the Christship of Jesus was the second. It was not enough that men should believe that the Kingdom was at hand; they must believe also that it is through the Lord that it will be established, and that He Himself is its Head and Centre. But the Lord did not leave His Apostles to proclaim Him as the Christ simply on the authority of His esoteric teaching. When it was too late in His earthly career for the proclamation to lead to any Messianic rising, He proclaimed His position Himself both on Palm Sunday and before Caiaphas, when He had to die for His "good confession." Even the robber understood: "Jesus, remember me when Thou comest in Thy Kingdom."

II

So, then, the Lord prepared for the full preaching of the Gospel by leading His Apostles to believe that He was indeed the Christ. But no sooner was that point gained than the Lord went further, and began to teach them that He was also that Suffering Servant of Yahweh of whom the Second Isaiah had spoken. "And he began to teach them, that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders, and the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again" (Mark viii. 31). Was it easy to teach them this? No, very difficult; and, often as the Lord spoke of it, He never seems to have spoken except to deaf ears. The "offence of the Cross" was to the Apostles then as great as to the Jews later on. There was, as far as we know, no expectation of a suffering Messiah; though there were facts in plenty to lead men to belief in the Lord's Messiahship, there were none as yet to lead them to believe that He was the Servant of Yahweh; and, above all, there are none so blind as those who do not want to see. So "Peter took Him, and began to rebuke Him" (Mark viii. 32); and when the teaching was repeated, the Apostles "understood not the saying, and were afraid to ask Him" (Mark ix. 32). But this, too, must one day have its place in the Gospel; and the facts will soon confirm the Lord's word only too clearly.

But before we turn to our Lord's preparation of His disciples by revealing this truth to them, we should notice the connection between the work of the Servant of the Lord and the work of the Messiah in bringing in the Kingdom. Observe that this connection is found at the very beginning of the Lord's ministry. "Thou art My beloved Son: in Thee I am well pleased." If you use your reference Bible, you will find that the words unite the two great lines of Old Testament prophecy. "The Son" is a Messianic title; the words that follow are taken from the first of the Songs of the Servant. But what is the logic of the connection? Why must the Messiah be the Suffering Servant of Yahweh also? The Christ has come to redeem the people of God, to restore to them the divine rule and the divine blessing. But why do they need this redemption and this restoration? Why has not God interfered on behalf of His people long ago, and vindicated them in the eyes of the world? To that question there can be but one answer: "Your iniquities have turned away these things, and your sins have withholden good from you" (Jer. v. 25). Or look at the question in another way. Suppose that, as our Lord said, the Kingdom of God is none the less at hand. Before the Kingdom stands the judgment; our Lord was as clear as to that as the Baptist himself. How will

it be with those who have not received the remission of sins? If no remission of sins, no kingdom. The desire of the people of God for remission of sins rested upon this ground. It was not chiefly that sin was felt as a moral defilement; it was rather that it was a hindrance to the coming or to the sharing of the Kingdom. The Baptist's call for repentance and the Pharisee's zeal for the law rested upon similar grounds. They desired that God should vindicate His people in the eyes of the world, and that the Kingdom should come for their glory, and not their shame. Moreover, our Lord had taken up the Baptist's proclamation; He, too, had told men to flee from the wrath to come (Mark xiii. 1 *ff.*). So far from teaching men, as it is sometimes said that He taught them, that physical disasters are not to be interpreted as God's judgments upon sin, He taught the contrary. Those who suffer from these disasters in a peculiar way are indeed not to be regarded as peculiarly sinful; but the disasters are the punishments of sin none the less. "Except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner perish." Yet more, our Lord had the deepest sense of the reality of sin; we are all debtors of the thousand talents; and He led others to feel its reality, not only by the sense that He brought of the nearness of God, but by the height of His moral standards. Our Lord held up before the eyes of men the divine standard of righteousness; He revoked all concessions to the hardness of men's hearts; He filled all the gaps in the old law; He insisted that it must be kept not only in act, but in word and in intention, and that the motive for keeping it must be not the praise of men, but the praise of God. Above all, He exhibited in His own life the realization of the standard that He set before others, so that nothing that He said could be discounted by pointing to any inconsistency of His action with it. Must not all this have sounded the knell of self-satisfaction? Unless their righteousness exceeded the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, men could in no case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven; and burdened as they were with the past, there could be no kingdom for them. What they needed was not just to be justified by the overthrow of their material enemies, but to be "justified from sin." Is it, then, any paradox to say that unless Jesus was more than the Christ, He could not be even the Christ; and that the work of the Christ, even as the highest ideals of the Old Testament had represented it, needed to be made possible by the work of the Suffering Servant? If the pleasure of the Lord was to prosper in His Hand, He must make His Soul an offering for sin; if He was to justify many, He must in some mysterious way have laid upon Him the iniquity of them all. When the Lord said that the Son of Man must suffer many things, the word "must" did not,

I would suggest, refer only to the fact that the Scriptures must be fulfilled; it referred also to the whole situation which the Scriptures had anticipated, the approaching Kingdom, and the inability of men as they were to enter in. That is why the Lord, wise as a serpent in baffling His enemies in the earlier stages of His ministry, makes no attempt to baffle them when His hour is come. He openly challenges them by the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, and the cleansing of the Temple; He claims openly to be the Christ, and is silent in the face of the charges made against Him. Others do not take His life away from Him; He lays it down of Himself.

How, then, did the Lord prepare His Apostles to preach Him, not only as the Christ, but as the Suffering Servant of Yahweh? At first, He seems to have spoken of His Death only in veiled language, as when He spoke of the feast of the Kingdom as being interrupted by the removal of the bridegroom, or—in the Fourth Gospel—of the Temple destroyed and in three days raised again, and of the serpent in the wilderness lifted up. But, when once faith in His Christship was attained, He spoke of His Passion again and again. Not only does He regard His Passion and Death as the fulfilment of prophecy, but it is plainly the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah that He has mainly in mind, with its companion, the 22nd Psalm, which he quoted on the Cross. On one occasion He directly quoted the language of the former. If He enters into details when He speaks of the Passion, but not when He speaks of rising again, it may be because the second Isaiah's picture, and the Psalmist's also, picture the one in detail, but not the other. It may even be, though I would not press this suggestion, that, though the Lord knew that His Death was necessary, if the Kingdom was to come, and that His victory would follow it, He did not Himself know in advance the form which the divine vindication would take. To "rise again" is in itself quite indefinite language; it needs the future to explain its meaning. It is His Death, at any rate, upon which He chiefly dwells. It is a cup, He says, which the Father has given Him to drink; it is a baptism, His path to a higher and more fruitful life. He has a baptism to be baptized with, and how is He straitened until it is accomplished! It is a ransom for our souls; so far from bringing the failure of His life and work, it is a great part of the purpose with which He came. "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." We have forfeited our true life; and none of us can by any means redeem his brother, or give to God a ransom for him. Nor can we ransom ourselves. "What should a man give to buy back his life?" But what no one else can do for us, and we cannot do for ourselves, He

can and will do for us. So He teaches that His Body is to be given for us, and His Blood shed "unto remission of sins." If the last words are only added in St. Matthew's Gospel, they are rightly added. Our Lord is thinking of the covenant sacrifice of Exodus xxiv., and there the burnt offerings are the primitive burnt offerings of expiation. Exactly the same is taught in Jeremiah's prophecy of the new covenant, which our Lord has also in mind. It is a covenant of the Spirit. "I will put My law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it." But the gift of the Spirit is bound up with the forgiveness of sins. "I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will I remember no more." Even here it is the Kingdom which is in view. Our Lord dies as the Passover Lamb to deliver His people from death that they may share the banquet of the Kingdom. "Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God" (Mark xiv. 25). "I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as My Father appointed unto Me, that ye may eat and drink at My table in My Kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Luke xxii. 29, 30). What, in view of all these facts, are we to think of Dr. Rashdall's attempt to deny that our Lord regarded His Death as having atoning value, and to maintain that the view that it had was an invention of the Early Church, strangely accepted by all, in order to account for the baffling mystery of the Messiah's death? We shall not find the atonement very prominent in the early Apostolic preaching, still less any theory about it. But we shall certainly expect to find the Lord identified from the first with the Suffering Servant of Yahweh.

H. L. GOUDGE.

(To be continued.)

THE SERVANT POEMS IN THE DEUTERO-ISAIAH*

ST. LUKE has left on record his conviction, or at least the conviction of his informant, that our Lord regarded certain passages in the Old Testament as prefiguring His passion. "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into His glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He

* The following study forms three lectures delivered to the Central Society of Sacred Study in Oxford on July 14-16, 1925. Much was necessarily left unsaid—*e.g.*, as to the historical situation, the earnest expectation of the coming kingdom, etc. But the object of the lectures was to serve as an indication of lines of study—not to present an exhaustive thesis.

expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning Himself." I have chosen to address you on this theme because there is a widespread belief, or uneasy suspicion, that the exegesis of the Old Testament in the New is fundamentally unsound; that the earlier writings will not bear the interpretation put upon them by the first Christian writers and preachers; and that consequently the claim of the Church to be the fulfilment of the Israelite church, and the claim of our Lord to be the fulfilment of Israelite prophecy, fall to the ground. So far as I am able to judge from sermons and articles on the Old Testament and from the answers of ordinands to questions on this subject, this belief in the fundamental unsoundness of the scriptural position of our Lord and His church is distressingly prevalent.

My object in the following papers is to examine the Old Testament passages which may fairly be presumed to have been expounded by our Lord on this occasion with the intention first of all of seeing what meaning they bore, or seemed to bear, to the prophet's contemporaries; to examine them in relation to their literary and historical setting; and finally to see whether there emerges any possibility of their legitimate application to the life and sufferings of Jesus of Nazareth in the way that St. Luke demands. I do not think it would be fair to expect that the subject will be exhaustively treated in these three lectures. Much must remain unsaid; and, after all, the Servant passages form only a part of Old Testament proof-texts appropriated by the apostolic community; but they are the keystone of the early Christian position. If in some way or other the inspired writers of the Old Testament did not, through the Holy Spirit, prepare the hearts of devout men for the advent of a Messiah whose earthly experience was to be conditioned by undeserved suffering, an untimely and premature death, and a mysterious vindication by the Almighty God of Israel, then we must face the inevitable conclusion that Christianity is not the fulfilment and logical development of all that was best, noblest, and uplifting in the religion of Israel, but is a pathetic and tragic misunderstanding. Noble in its self-sacrifice and ideal of universal service, yet miserable in that it has staked its all on a false identification. It cannot be supposed with any philosophical justification that it is possible to admit that our Lord misunderstood the meaning of the Old Testament prophecies; that he falsely conceived it His duty to suffer and to die; and yet to swallow with half-closed eyes the miracles of the Resurrection or Incarnation. This is precisely what He would warn us against: the swallowing of the camel and the straining out of the gnat. There is a species of intellectual dishonesty, no doubt unconscious, but still dishonesty, most unhappily frequent

to-day. By claiming to accept the stupendous men hope to gain relief from the examination of the more ordinary. But is not this to give the lie to all the scientific method of the last centuries: to run from evolution to intervention, from ordered progress to violent interference with the order of nature? Thus treated the life of Christ is placed in a vacuum; it has relation to nothing. But *if* it can be set in intimate natural relationship with the religious experience of the people of God, it has coherence. If it could be shown that there was some sort of guiding hand behind the religious development of Israel, it would enormously strengthen belief in a personal God.

I have ventured to put before you considerations which seem to me vital, not to exhibit an external force which might seem to some to compel the acceptance of an orthodox interpretation of the Old Testament, but in order to stress the urgency of a thorough examination of the interpretation of the Old Testament current at the present time, and to create a demand for a reinvestigation of the whole subject. The influence of the Old Testament on English history, theology, literature, and thought has been almost incomprehensibly profound. It cannot be denied that it has an appeal to the picturesque and the romantic, with its background of Eastern colour where men and women, by no means indifferent to the joys of this world, somehow manage to please God. Their feet of clay, dear simple creatures, have come under the magnifying glass of some generations of biblical scholars, and if they have a heart of gold, it is not so easily discerned. A cold wind from the north has swept away the blue haze in which they once appeared to move, and now we see them better, and, alas! sometimes know them less, as they shiver in a blast of criticism alien to their minds and race. Perchance, like the traveller of old, once the sport of the elements they will not give up their secret to the wind, but wrap the guarding cloak more closely round their shrinking forms. To the genial understanding sun alone will they confide themselves naked and unashamed. If I may be allowed to follow up my metaphor, I would say that now, when the wind has done its worst, is the time to let the sun of sympathetic interest endeavour to show these figures revered of centuries in a clearer light. Everything that could shelter them has been blown away, save the divine secret they claimed to possess; this it is our privilege reverently to seek to discover.

I shall ask you to focus your attention on one writer with the sole intention of trying to discover what he meant, whether he spoke of someone or some body of persons past, present, or to come; whether he regarded the person or persons as ideal or real; and the probability or otherwise of his contemporaries

applying the prophecy to any particular individual. But inasmuch as the Servant poems are only fragments of a great literature, we cannot entirely isolate them so as to leave out of discussion the prophets and the prophetic writings as a whole. It is a platitude that no prophet can be isolated from the thought and life of his own age.

The late Dr. Driver has written: "The prophets, one and all, stand in an intimate relation to the history of their times. Whatever be the truth which they announce, it is never presented by them in an abstract form; it is always brought into some relation with the age in which they live, and adapted to the special circumstances of the persons whom they address."* This is a well-authenticated truth, but it can be pressed too far. And those who constantly assert it as a maxim forget sometimes that this great master of the Old Testament added: "Of course, the principles which the prophets assert are frequently capable of a much wider range of application." That ancient saying that prophecy is history written beforehand has been denied too hotly. Reactions are seldom well-balanced, and it is just as false to look upon the prophets as mere enunciators of great moral truths who sometimes attempted a lucky forecast of coming events, as it is to regard them as prognosticators of the world's future history. The truth lies midway between these extremes. The prophets *were* great preachers and teachers; their interests were perhaps primarily with the men of their own generation and their immediate descendants; but their horizon was not bounded by their grandchildren. They were also men of boldness and daring, who were able to survey the history of their race from its idolatrous beginnings in Mesopotamia to its destined future as the living tabernacle of the visible presence of God. Generalizations are most dangerous, and it is highly doubtful whether the prophets have a common measure, or whether we can speak or think of them as homogeneous. What is there in common between the homicidal passion of Elijah and Elisha, true faithful worshippers of Jehovah according to their light, and the self-annihilating love of the Servant of Jehovah; or, in what picture shall we reconcile the compassionate solicitude of the author of the Book of Jonah for Nineveh, the bloody city of Nahum who exulted over its downfall. These examples would seem to prove the truth of the axiom that the prophets are limited in horizon to the visible world of their own time. But what of such passages as Isa. xi. 1-9, of which I cite only verses 1-2 and 6 and 9: "And there shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a branch out of his roots shall bear fruit: and the spirit of the Lord

* *Isaiah: His Life and Times*, p. 3.

shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord; . . . and the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. . . . They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." And again, Ezekiel xlvii., of which I cite only verse 12: "And by the river upon the bank thereof, on this side and on that side, shall grow every tree for meat, whose leaf shall not wither, neither shall the fruit thereof fail: it shall bring forth new fruit every month, because the waters thereof issue out of the sanctuary: and the fruit thereof shall be for meat, and the leaf thereof for healing." True it is that the seed of the prophet's conception is to be seen in the world of his day; but the full growth is only found in generations yet unborn. The beauty and the limitations of mediæval thought are similarly well marked in Dante and Milton; but their vision is consciously, purposefully, projected on to the world of the unknown future or the spiritual kingdom not yet revealed by God. All these men were greater than their knowledge. In what is now the true spirit of scientific enquiry they proceeded from the known to the unknown. They spoke of what was not, and could not be, in their own time. When, at what precise point of time, are we to suppose, did Isaiah think that the earth should be filled with "the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea"? When did Ezekiel imagine that the mysterious river and the tree of healing were to spring forth in Jerusalem? To ask these questions is to recognize their futility, and at the same time, let it be added, to vindicate the breadth of the prophets' vision. Nay, indeed, if the prophets *merely* "adapted [the truth which they announced] to the special circumstances of the persons whom they addressed," the whole subsequent history of the Jewish people is an enigma. The earnest expectation of a coming deliverer, which even now sustains the true Jew in his battle with materialism, is only to be accounted for by the Jewish interpretation of the prophets as men who spake from God of things to come. Whether the Jews misinterpreted the promises, whether the sin of later generations has succeeded in frustrating for a time the purpose of God, is not the point. The fact remains that from before the exile onwards, wherever evidence is forthcoming, the Jews looked for the advent of a heaven-sent deliverer.

The passages cited, which, as any reader of the Old Testament knows, might be multiplied ten times, are sufficient to show that though the prophets' utterances were closely or loosely

attached to contemporary events according to the nature of their message, they were often independent of time. The prophets learned as we learn in our lives, as I believe our Lord learned, what was the will and developing purpose of God. That wonderful passage from Isaiah from which I have quoted was not the first thing Isaiah had to say about the Messianic king. He had, as a much younger man, pictured the Righteous King arising in his own time from the apparent temporal ruin of Judea to usher in a reign of purity and love. In this last abiding utterance, when the Assyrians were on the march to Jerusalem, the prophet defies—sublimely defies—the limitations of his own time. If there is any relation whatever between Isaiah's prophecy and " the special circumstances of the persons whom he addressed," it is the relation of paradox. Victorious peace, joyful communion with God, a government inspired in its wisdom, divine in its justice, reducing even the savageness of the brute creation to the calm peace of the lamb and the little child. A strange message to those plundered, despoiled, and fugitive! A people whose land lay in the power of the most ruthless nation of antiquity, whose puny strength was as that of a little child pitted against an Assyrian wolf.

Yet another conception of Isaiah, to which we shall return in our study of the Servant of Jehovah, is that of the all but universal acceptance of the religion of Israel. The worship of Jehovah will not be forced on their neighbours by the sword, but the nations will voluntarily, spontaneously, flow into Jerusalem as to their spiritual home. Isaiah is a poet. As a poet he describes the universal acceptance of Jehovah as the god of all the earth in the procession composed of representatives of all nations, who throng triumphantly up the slopes of the hill of Zion to offer their prayers and praises to the God of Israel. Need we suppose that this sagacious man, fully alive to the dangerous significance of the innumerable intrigues of the court with the surrounding nations, expected this wonderful bouleversement in his own time? Is it even conceivable that he who wrestled for years with the unbelief and unreality of contemporary Judean religion, who scourged with his denunciations the ritual abuses and luxurious excesses of his age, should have omitted the painful preliminaries of precept and example necessary to reclaim people more godless, more cruel, and more decadent than his own?

By all means let us elucidate the message of the prophets from our ever-increasing knowledge of the circumstances of their time. Let us marvel at the sublime optimism of Isaiah while we hold in our hands a cuneiform illustration of the barbarous onslaughts of Sennacherib's battalions; but do not let

us be so uncritical, so unimaginative, as to suppose that these men of God spake only to the men of their generation.

Much has been written, and is still being written, on comparative religion, which tends to show that there was a great deal in common between the religion of Israel and that of their neighbours. Many parallels in the accompaniments of worship, altars, sacred poles, standing stones, and the veneration of sanctuaries, have been demonstrated. The prophets, too, have suffered in some respects, especially the earlier ones. The artificial stimulation of a prophetic frenzy by the use of music and the excitement of dancing have been cited as proofs that the prophets of Israel are in origin little, if at all, better than the heathen prophets of their neighbours. But the important difference is often overlooked or minimized. The Moabites and Syrians, the Babylonians and Egyptians, did not simply disappear from the world like the brontosaurus. Their descendants to-day are probably more numerous than the children of Abraham. Their prophets and their religion have perished because they possessed no germ of immortality among them. The prophets of Israel have survived, not because the Jews are more fiercely national than other peoples, but because the prophets spoke of universal truth and righteousness, of ideals which still shine in the far distant future; and of one God whose self-revelation has been by all observers deemed convincing. Unless a mere book-knowledge of the prophets is to be our goal, the best method of arriving at a spiritual understanding of their message would seem to be through the study and humble imitation of contemporary prophets. That elusive person "the ordinary man" of all ages does not greatly alter, if we can judge from the tittle-tattle of the domestic correspondence of the Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, and English. And we need expect to find little difference between the eighth or sixth century Israelite and his Gentile contemporaries. His ideas of evil spirits, sacred objects, and such matters probably differed little, if at all, from theirs. Then, as now, progress intellectual and ethical lay in the great men of the time. And the great men of biblical times may fairly be held unique until adequate material for comparison has been discovered in the ancient world. The study of other ancient religions is of great value in showing the prevalence of certain theological concepts, and more especially of religious or quasi-religious customs, but any body of teaching like that of the Hebrew prophets extending over centuries and culminating in the humble and exalted figure of the Servant of Jehovah—ideal and real—is still to seek. Indeed, it is surely a suggestive fact that the memorials of other Semitic religions have survived only because they were

overwhelmed and buried in the contemptuous neglect of their devotees, while the prophets of Israel have remained through the ages "a light to lighten the gentiles." This is the more remarkable in that a common origin for Israelite and heathen soothsaying may fairly be claimed. It can hardly be an accident that the prophets always used poetry as the vehicle of their message. The Semitic poet has ever had an extraordinary influence over his countrymen. Here let me quote the words of a distinguished American Arabist: "When he sang before the tribe on the day of battle and onset, it was as though a spirit sang through him. When he brooded in the council, and then suddenly arose and flung out his judgment in clanging words and ringing rhymes, it was as the utterance of a god. . . . Often, as to Socrates, his own decision must have come as with a voice from without, and it would take little to add a visible form. . . . That poetry and prophecy, for the early Arabs and Hebrews, both go back to inspiration from the Unseen, and are, for many purposes, a practical unit, I now take for granted."* Before continuing it is right to record the writer's important and significant words, "I know nowhere in the Semitic world any appearance like that of the great prophets of the Hebrews."†

Two modern lines of investigation have converged on the Hebrew prophets: first the comparative method, and secondly the examination of prophecy in the light of psychology. The question in the first case is, What claim has Hebrew prophecy to superiority over other prophecy? And in the second, What reason is there for believing that the Hebrew prophets were the recipients of a divine revelation? These questions are really one and the same, and call for a special treatise for their proper treatment. The very phenomena which to the original hearers were the guarantee of the prophets' inspiration to us are the objects of grave suspicion. Ecstasy, rapid excited utterance, and fevered movement are nowadays referred to psychic disturbances in that hypothetical creature the subconscious mind. But here two points must be kept in mind: these adventitious aids to prophecy tend to disappear as Hebrew religion advances and deepens. Amos expressly disclaims any connection with professional prophets and their ways; and Isaiah's vision in the Temple can only bear one interpretation to the religious man—the prophet's longing for a visible manifestation of God met by a vision of the glory of God's presence. And, again, such work as the prophets felt themselves called upon to undertake could only be undertaken by abnormal men. No genius is normal; if he were normal, he would not be a genius. It is not

* D. B. Macdonald, *Religious Attitude and Life in Islam*, p. 24.
† P. 14.

possible to forecast or assess the actions of men in the throes of a great battle or a great religious crisis, and the prophets often delivered their utterances under the compulsion of both.

The questions I have raised are really one, and the answer is one. *The unique value of Hebrew prophecy lies in the prophetic conception of God*, which is seen in its perfection in Isaiah xl. to lv. The most remarkable feature in prophecy is the bond which unites prophets of widely different characters and ages; and that bond is the sense of divine compulsion. They do not claim inspiration in order to gain credence for their message; they do claim that they are acting under the compelling hand of God. If we doubt the reality of this, we cannot doubt that the prophets *felt* it to be a reality. Under this indestructible conviction they faced insult, ridicule, misunderstanding, persecution, and death. Moses, now regarded by many as the founder of the Hebrew religion, makes an uncomfortable impression on the reader of his life when he seeks to evade by every means the difficult and dangerous task allotted to him by the God of his race (Exod. iii. 11, and iv. 10-16). Amos is a clear example of a simple peasant filled with the consciousness of a heavenly call to an enterprise which, from its very nature, could only bring him insult and possibly imprisonment and death. And Jeremiah shrinkingly and reluctantly takes up his lifework of resistance to the feelings and sentiments of his nation as an act of obedience. Here let me quote the fine words of Skinner on Jeremiah as an inspired preacher: "Jeremiah is conscious of standing in a personal relation to God, which we may call confidential, and of which the false prophets can have no experience. . . . He has stood in the council of Yahweh, has heard His word, has been sent by Him. His whole conscious life is pervaded by this conviction, which had come to him at the moment of his call—that before his birth he had been predestined and consecrated to the mission of a prophet. It is this which gives him the assurance that the truth which he perceives, whether it come to him through a vision, or an audition, or by direct spiritual intuition, is a revelation of the mind and will of Yahweh. This immediate consciousness of having the mind of God is the ultimate secret of true prophetic inspiration which, being incommunicable, can neither be analyzed nor applied as an objective criterion of an alleged revelation. It is strictly analogous to the experience of religious certainty in general—the *testimonium internum Spiritus Sancti*, 'bearing witness with our spirits that we are children of God.' . . . Real prophecy . . . is not a series of casual, spasmodic, abnormal illuminations, having no relation to ultimate reality; but a reflection in human thought of the infinite Wisdom which

reigns throughout the universe and through all ages: a revelation of one overruling purpose by which the whole round world is in every way bound with gold chains about the feet of God."*

The attendant circumstances of trance or vision are neither evidence for the reality of the prophets' revelation nor evidence on which we may degrade the message to the rank of heathen soothsaying. Their guarantee is in the paramount influence they have wielded, impressing upon men's minds throughout the ages a sense of the holiness and righteousness of God, and the possibility—the practical possibility—of communion and mystical intercourse with him.

May we, then, approach the subject of our study with two premises taken as secure: first, that the Hebrew prophets often delivered themselves under this strange compulsion of utterances which had little relation to the men of their day, and secondly, that their word was the word of God. I desire to qualify this last premise with two sayings of St. Paul: "We have this treasure in earthen vessels" (2 Cor. iv. 7), and "Prophesy according to the measure of faith." A reasonable and sane application of these principles should be our method in dealing with both Old and New Testament prophecies.

ALFRED GUILLAUME.

(To be continued.)

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE CONFESSIONAL

THERE are, broadly speaking, two classes of persons to be found in the confessional. There are, first, those whom we may perhaps describe as ordinary sinners; and, secondly, there are those who should primarily be regarded as the victims of moral disease. Since there will be some who will dispute this distinction,† it is necessary to say something in defence and explanation of it before proceeding further. The sinner is one who, while knowing the better, more or less deliberately chooses the worse; the victim of moral disease, on the other hand, is one who feels himself impelled to do something against which, he will tell you, his whole being seems to protest. It will be remembered that some time ago a correspondence took place in *The Times* concerning the doctrine of "irresistible" impulses, those who believe in the existence of such impulses wishing to modify the law so as to exculpate the victims of them. It is

* *Prophecy and Religion: Studies in the Life of Jeremiah*, by John Skinner. Cambridge, pp. 195-196 and 199.

† Maintained by Dr. Hadfield in *Psychology and Morals*, chap. vi.

not necessary that we should here pronounce in favour of such "irresistible" impulses. All that is necessary for our present purpose is that we should allow (what surely cannot be denied) that strange and powerful impulses, evidently emanating from the unconscious, do move the soul of man. In positing the existence of such impulses, it is not needful to enter into the question of our responsibility for them. Suffice it to say that in some cases the subject of them is responsible for the act or acts from which they have ultimately sprung, while in other cases he is not. It is to be noted that in the case of these impulses, which we would generally group under the name of moral disease, the subject is often impelled to actions which in themselves are irrational. Thus, for example, in the moral disease known as kleptomania we have not, as might be supposed and as the popular use of the term implies, a tendency to lay hands on valuable articles of all kinds, but rather a tendency to appropriate small and utterly useless articles, which no sensible person would risk anything to obtain.

The exact point where the line is to be drawn between sin and moral disease it is difficult to decide, as also is the question, in any particular case, how far a person is to be regarded as a deliberate sinner, and how far as the victim of moral disease. But the broad distinction seems to be a justifiable one, and it is very convenient to retain its use in dealing with the matters of the confessional. We shall, therefore, make use of this two-fold division in the following remarks which we have to offer. In dealing with the ordinary sinner the confessor acts primarily, as we shall see, in his capacity as judge; in dealing with victims of moral disease he acts pre-eminently in his capacity as spiritual physician. Let us see what light psychology can give us on these points.

In so far as the priest is dealing with the class of normal sinners, one of the first essentials is that he should be able to place his man. He is a judge, and he must be able to form some kind of judgment as to the penitent's character. Some clergy have this capacity intuitively. Such are the men who make wise confessors, without the aid of psychology. They have an almost uncanny power of fathoming motives and reading character. It will be remembered that Newman called this power the illative sense. But with the majority of priests this is not the case, and they will turn readily to psychology for any help it can give them in the reading of character. There is such help ready to hand in the teaching of Dr. Jung concerning psychological types. These types are the modern equivalents for the old doctrine of the four temperaments, which still remains, of course, in our common speech. Instead of finding

four temperaments, Jung has said that there are fundamentally two, and these he has called the extrovert and the introvert; but recently he has subdivided each of these types into four divisions, giving in all eight types. It will, however, be sufficient for our present purpose to pay attention chiefly to the two main types. The extrovert is the type of person who finds it easy to get into touch with the outer world. His chief interest is always in the outer world, and he always feels at home in it. The introvert, on the other hand, does not readily come out of his shell, to use the common expression. He is very introspective, and is interested in himself. Jung thought at one time that the extrovert was always a pre-eminently emotional type, and the introvert was always a thinking type, but, as a result of further experience in dealing with the various types, he has changed his opinions on this matter, so that he admits that we may get a thinking type of either an introvert or an extrovert kind; and the same applies to a feeling type. It is a matter of importance that the priest should be able to place his penitent (as the majority of persons can be placed) under one of these types. If the penitent is an extrovert, it will probably be the case that whatever else he may know or not know, he will not know himself. This will be his blind spot, as Dr. Nicoll has put it.* The introvert, on the other hand, will be for ever peering into himself, and will tend to know himself. Roughly speaking, we may say that the extrovert corresponds to the old-fashioned sanguine and choleric temperaments, whereas the introvert corresponds to the melancholic and the phlegmatic.

It is not a little remarkable that our Lord, in the parable of the sower, seems to anticipate modern psychology. It is true that there are four kinds of soil mentioned, but they cannot *all* be readily regarded as standing for types of temperament. Which, for example, is the good ground, and which is the thorny? A closer examination of the parable seems to point to the fact that there are only two kinds of temperament in His mind—the hard, wayside ground, and the stony. The thorny and the good soil seem to stand not so much for temperaments as ways of life. The thorny is the worldly life, and the good represents the Christian way of life. Thus we are left with the wayside and the stony soils, corresponding exactly with the introvert and the extrovert respectively. The hard-trodden wayside is the introvert with his compressed nature, if we may so put it. This it is which makes it so difficult for him to respond to outer influences. The stony is the extrovert, the most prominent weakness in whose character is inclined to be shallowness. He makes a rapid response, but has no depth.

* *Dream Psychology*, p. 142.

The method of dealing with these types is the opposite in each case. The introvert usually needs encouragement. He finds the world at the best of times a hard place, and if he receives kindness and sympathy, he will often develop. The extrovert, on the other hand, very often wants sterner treatment, and as a rule he is thick-skinned enough to take it without suffering harm.

Another way in which psychology can help the priest in his office of judge is by showing us the importance of some knowledge of the penitent's family, where it is obtainable. Of especial significance is the quality of the father. Some psychologists claim that the influence of the father is so important that religion is nothing but a " projection " of our relation to our fathers when we were children. Without, of course, admitting the truth of this sweeping statement, nevertheless it is undoubtedly the case that many persons' outlook on religion is hardly more than a reflection of their attitude to their fathers. Here let us quote Dr. Hadfield: " Our fathers and our mothers are, in fact, our first gods, before we are capable of knowing God. If, therefore, the father was very lenient in early childhood, the son tends to grow up to think of God as a kindly, benevolent old gentleman. If, on the other hand, our father is severe, we tend to think of God as being severe. If our fathers were bad-tempered, then we tend to believe in God as a bad-tempered person, as Jehovah sometimes showed himself to be in the Old Testament. If, on the other hand, our fathers were over-affectionate, we tend to get an erotic tendency towards God and Christ. Again, if the father is tyrannical, the child tends to rebel, and in after life you find him becoming an atheist—that is to say, he rebels against his father, and his rebellion against God takes the form of denying His existence. If our fathers made us terrified by putting moral injunctions upon us, we tend in after life to a religion that is over-scrupulous and over-conscientious."* This teaching, no doubt, readily lends itself to exaggeration, but there can be little doubt that it contains much truth, and the priest will accordingly be well advised, whenever possible, to take note of the fathers of his regular penitents, in attempting to estimate the characters of the latter. It will sometimes explain things which at first sight appear unintelligible. It is often helpful also to know the penitent's place in the family. If he is an only son, there will always be the possibility that he will have an exaggerated idea of his importance, because his parents will have devoted all their attentions to him. If, however, he is the eldest son (especially if he be the elder of two), there will always be the chance that the jealousy which he

* *The Modern Churchman*, September, 1924.

felt when his little brother was born has permanently given his character a twist.

Closely allied to the above is the phenomenon known to psychologists as auto-eroticism. Auto-eroticism, or self-love, is a characteristic of the small infant. In the first instance this self-love has to do with its own body, in which it is keenly interested, and, indeed, its chief business every day consists in bodily gratification. If the child is well brought up, it will be rapidly led on from this frame of mind to one more altruistic; but it is unfortunately by no means rare to find children who are allowed to grow up with this attitude but little modified. Such children are given in to upon every possible occasion, and it can, therefore, hardly be surprising if the religion of these same children should tend to be auto-erotic. It will be for them merely a refined form of selfishness. They will tend to regard themselves as the special favourites of the Almighty; and when any misfortune is allowed by Providence to come their way, they are likely to lose their "faith." They will cry, "How could God be so cruel?" The priest will not fail to find persons of this kind both inside and outside the confessional. The remedy is almost too obvious to need stating; they must gently but firmly be shown the true state of affairs in their religion, of which, of course, they have no inkling.

This leads on, naturally, to the whole question of self-knowledge, and of what the Psalmist called "secret sins," which are not, of course, sins committed on the sly, but those the existence of which we are ignorant. The psychological mechanism, known as "projection," throws much light on this class of sins. Projection is the common habit of fastening our own sins upon other people, and condemning them roundly. It is an entirely unconscious process, the reason for which is that it enables us to derive satisfaction from denouncing our sins without denouncing ourselves. This is why, as is well known, people are frequently hardest on others for the very faults which are most glaring in themselves. Our Lord surely had this in mind when He uttered the words "Judge not, that ye be not judged." It follows from this that one of the most fruitful methods of getting at our root sins is to ask ourselves whether there is any fault which we are habitually finding in other people; if there is, we may be sure that if we examine ourselves closely, we shall find it in our own hearts. The priest will, therefore, advise his penitents to do this, if they find self-examination difficult, or if he suspects them of being the victims of self-deception. As Dr. Hadfield has pointed out, whenever we hear a person for ever denouncing a particular sin, we can turn round and say

without the slightest hesitation, as Nathan did to David, " Thou art the man."*

This blindness as to our faults is closely allied to our ignorance of our true motives. Modern psychology has had a great deal to say about the unconscious motive. Let us, in this connection, quote a short passage from Dr. Crichton Miller's book, *The New Psychology and the Preacher*. He writes as follows: " The new psychology differs from the old academic psychology in one fundamental point. It takes into consideration the unconscious motive as a dynamic factor. The old psychology failed to recognize or, at best, attributed but trifling value to any mental factor which happened to be outside the field of consciousness. Thus, when a man proclaimed himself a convinced believer in—let us say—the divine right of kings, it limited its investigations to the grounds upon which he based his conviction. The new psychology, on the other hand, seeks out reasons for such a belief which are not present in the believer's consciousness, some of which reasons he may even repudiate energetically. It asks, for instance, what the believer has to gain or lose by the general rejection of such a view. It asks how far the belief was held by his parents or by others with whom he tends to identify himself. It seeks to trace the source of the belief, and investigates the circumstances under which it first took form. It may even study the individual's dream-life to ascertain what light, if any, can be derived from this source. In short, the new psychology refuses to accept *prima facie* evidence as adequate in the study of the human mind.

" As a consequence it follows that much of what we attribute to worthy motives has to be put down to unworthy or, at least, less worthy motives. In the light of analytical psychology we find ourselves much less respectable than we previously imagined ourselves to be " (*op. cit.*, p. 17).

But we have ever at hand the facile mental mechanism, known to psychologists as rationalization, which is familiar to all those who have any acquaintance with modern psychology. By means of this we are able to persuade ourselves that our motives are good when, in fact, they are bad. This is clearly a factor of great importance in the confessional. The priest will, therefore, not put too high a value on the account which the penitent gives of his motives; and he will never cease to impress upon him the exceeding deceitfulness of sin, and enjoin the constant use of the prayer, " Cleanse thou me from my secret faults." He will warn him from ever supposing that he fully knows himself and his sins by pointing out that knowledge of ourselves is an ever-deepening and growing thing, corresponding with our growth

* *Psychology and Morals*, p. 35.

in the knowledge and love of God. In this way, perhaps, he will save him from falling into the fatal snare of self-satisfaction, which is by no means distant from those who make a regular use of the sacrament of penance, as well as those who stay away altogether.

Before we pass to the second division of our subject, that dealing with penitents who may be regarded as suffering from moral disease, it will be convenient to tackle a problem which may be treated as falling on the borderline between the normal sinner and the victim of moral disease. This is the problem of the recidivist. It is important at the outset to distinguish between two classes of backsliders: (*a*) those who are really trying, and (*b*) those who only *think* that they are trying. To take the latter first, it will be evident, from what we have said about the unconscious motive, that it will always be possible for penitents to belong to the class of recidivists because they have never really attempted to take themselves in hand at all. One of the surest signs of this is that the penitent is always changing his confessor. His reason for doing this (quite an unconscious reason, of course) is in order that he may not be under a consistent rule of discipline, and also that he may obtain absolution on easier terms. Anyone with any knowledge of what Freud calls the "advantage through illness," will realize that this diagnosis of such cases is accurate. Let us take an example which he gives us of the "advantage through illness" —we take it from his most illuminating *Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis*—"A woman who is brutally treated and mercilessly exploited by her husband fairly regularly takes refuge in a neurosis, if her disposition admits of it. Her illness becomes her weapon in the struggle against him, one that she can use for her protection, or misuse for purposes of revenge. She can complain of her illness, though she probably dare not complain of her marriage; her doctor is her ally; the husband, who is otherwise so ruthless, is required to spare her, to spend money on her, to grant her absence from him, and thus some freedom from marital oppression. Whenever this external or 'accidental' advantage through illness is at all pronounced, and no substitute can be found for it in reality, you need not look forward very hopefully to influencing the neurosis by your therapy" (p. 320). Thus far Freud. We must, of course, grasp firmly the fact that this "advantage through illness" is only appreciated unconsciously. And the same will apply to the recidivist, who will be totally unaware that his frequent changing of his confessor is due to a desire to get absolution on easy terms. This is clearly a situation which requires very careful handling. If the priest taxes the penitent outright with the truth, he may

only succeed in driving him away from the sacrament altogether. But one thing is certain. He has somehow got to see that he does not go off to some other priest. He will probably succeed best in this by showing him kindness, especially at first, and then, by gaining his confidence, he will be able to show him the right way to fight his temptations. This leads us on to the other type of recidivist, the one who is really trying.

There can be no doubt whatever that psychology has thrown a flood of light on this question. It has done so by formulating the famous Law of Reversed Effort, which explains why it is that the harder we try to do certain things, the worse we fail. The simplest case of this is that of acquiring some art—*e.g.*, learning to ride a bicycle. Everyone knows that when in the course of our struggles we encounter a large stone in the middle of the road, the harder we try to avoid it, the more inevitably we run into it. And the same applies to fighting what we call evil habits. The reason for this is that all our attempts to fight the enemy really merely suggest its power over us, and so we are delivered into its hands. We shall only succeed in our efforts when we can make them without handicapping ourselves by the fatal suggestion that we are up against a big proposition. Coué has put this by saying that it is our imaginations rather than our wills which need reinforcing; and though the accuracy of this terminology has been questioned with much reason, yet as a working statement of the case it is valuable. In dealing with the recidivist who is trying, therefore, we must in some way kindle his imagination so that he may suggest to himself that he is succeeding in overcoming the bad habit, instead of the reverse, which is the case when we tell him that he must fight hard against it. How are we to do this ? The Bishop of Manchester, in an article in *The Pilgrim*, has pointed out that St. Paul's teaching on the nature of faith and its relation to what he called works is precisely in accord with the teaching of Coué. Faith is a state in which our imagination pictures victory vividly to our minds. That is why it succeeds when the hard striving associated with the word " works " fails utterly, because in the latter case the imagination tends to be fighting against us instead of on our side. It is plain, therefore, that in dealing with this class of penitents *the one fatal mistake is to urge them to fight harder against the evil habit.* Rather the priest must tell them that when the temptation comes, if they will make simple acts of faith in our Blessed Lord, it will not be long before they experience His deliverance. Above all, he needs to impress upon them that the actual temptation to the evil habit is not sin, so that they need not be worried if they are

frequently attacked. Many a penitent is undone by failing to distinguish between temptation and sin.

We now pass to the second part of our subject—namely, that dealing with penitents who are in some measure definitely neurotic, a by no means small class, as every confessor will agree. In this connection it was inevitable that a parallel should be drawn between psycho-analysis and confession. They plainly have obvious points of similarity, into which we need not go here, as they will be familiar to us all. But of late the tendency has been to decry this analogy, largely on the ground that in psycho-analysis we are concerned with the unconscious, whereas in confession we are concerned with the conscious. But this distinction the present writer believes to be unsound, as he will endeavour to show. What, then, happens when a neurotic person comes to confession ? There is, of course, no attempt to dig up his complexes, whatever they may be. But in spite of this, it is quite evident on purely psychological grounds (to say nothing of theological ones) that these complexes may be reached. For it is now known that in psycho-analytic treatment the neurosis can be resolved without the repressed material actually coming into consciousness. This can be done by means of what is called the " transference." This latter is the process whereby the emotion attached to the repressed thoughts is transferred to the analyst. Sometimes the transference is what is called " positive "—*i.e.*, a feeling of attraction ranging from open love-making to mere adulation in general; sometimes it is " negative," when it will be characterized by feelings of repulsion. Here let us quote from a book by Dr. Wittels,* where he writes as follows: " We tell the patient that he is to remember. In a profound sense he always knows what we want him to remember, for though he can repress it from his consciousness, he cannot really expel it from his mind. The symptoms from which he suffers, the dyspnœa, the dread of bridges, etc., are symbolical memories. He is continually relieving in this way the painful experience. The patient has hitherto been lonely in the process of relieving. Now, in the physician, he has won the friend to whom he has to pour out his soul. He confesses partly in words, and partly by transferring upon the physician that which he has once lived through. In his unconsciousness he terms the physician his father, his brother, his friend. Nay more, the unconscious ignores differences of sex. The physician is his father, his brother, his sister, his inamorata. He loves the analyst, or hates him, according to the nature of the repressed experiences, for which the analyst acts as a substitute. The resistance is only at work to prevent

* *Sigmund Freud*, p. 78 (English translation).

the putting of the memory into words; it has no power over the transference. . . . A recognized transference is as good a remedial measure as a memory recalled in words. We cure the patient in so far as we can receive his transference." If this is true, and we are quoting from an experienced analyst, then the parallel between analysis and confession becomes very real. And there can be no doubt that experience supports the analogy. It is no uncommon thing for the priest in the confessional to receive transferences, not only from women, but also from men, especially adolescent lads. It is plain that here he is placed in a very great difficulty, and is at a serious disadvantage as compared with the doctor. When the latter receives the transference, as he regularly does, he simply tells the patient why she has fallen in love with him, and that if it had not been with him, it would have been with whomsoever was conducting the case; and apparently the patient recognizes the truth of this, and all is well. But it is far more difficult in the confessional. It is impossible for the priest to attempt to explain the situation as the doctor does in like circumstances; that is plain. The usual practice of priests is probably that they reject the transference absolutely, and rebuke the penitent. But from the psychological point of view this means that they are losing a golden opportunity and, in fact, running a serious risk of injuring the penitent's soul. Perhaps a way out of the difficulty may be found by accepting the transference, but at the same time leading it on to our Lord. In this case the confessor would point out to the penitent that she owes everything to Him, and that the priest is really entirely helpless apart from the divine help. If such a transference can be made, then the spiritual value of it for the penitent will clearly be enormous.

Further, it is necessary to bear in mind that if, in the matter of the transference, the confessor is at a disadvantage as compared with the doctor, in another way he has an enormous advantage over him. He can dispense the power of absolution, which a study of the Biblical teaching on the operations of the Holy Spirit seems to lead us to believe will work especially in the penitent's unconscious. By this means the transference, it may be believed, will be permanently made to our Lord.

There is one more point to be considered in connection with neurotic penitents generally. A very common cause of repression in people's lives seems to be the horror of having committed a terrible sin. This is very liable to occur in the case of those who, in their childhood, were brought up on very strict and Puritanical lines. It may have been that they were rebuked, when quite tiny children, for some trifling fault with excessive severity. Such cases are by no means rare, as, for instance,

when the mother, or the nurse, tells the disobedient child that God no longer loves him, or that bad boys and girls are sent to Hell. The effect of this kind of teaching is definitely to warp the child's whole attitude to religion. It may lead in the end to complete and open antagonism to it, and so the conflict may be solved disastrously in that way. On the other hand, it may be repressed in the unconscious, while the child grows up with complete outward conformity to the demands of its religion. But all the while this repressed experience will be working underground in the unconscious, and ultimately is not unlikely to issue in some definite neurosis. If, however, such a person is brought to confession, the very nature of the whole act of making a confession will tend to put matters right. But, of course, the great difficulty in such cases will be to get the individual to come to confession at all, as he will find it hard to believe in the possibility of forgiveness.

It is worth while to add in this connection, as Dr. Thouless has pointed out,* that the practice of the confessional is a powerful aid against the danger of getting a morbid idea of the nature of sin, though it must be admitted that it is not a very common danger in these days of light-hearted carelessness in which we live.

In conclusion, let us turn our attention to a problem of great importance and difficulty in the confessional—the problem of scrupulosity, on which the writer believes that psychology can give us some assistance. Now there can be little doubt that scrupulousness is ultimately a matter of anxiety. So Jeremy Taylor thought. "Fear is the disease," he wrote,† and he showed his remarkable insight in the matter when he pointed out its close resemblance to what psychologists now call phobias; the particular one he mentions is fear of frogs.‡ Let us see, then, if psychology can aid us in our attempt to solve the very difficult problem of the scrupulous.

Fear or anxiety, according to Freud,§ is of two kinds. There is (*a*) what he calls "floating fear"—*i.e.*, fear of everything in general, but nothing in particular; and (*b*) there is fear of particular objects, which is now technically called a phobia. A good instance would be the one mentioned by Jeremy Taylor. With regard to the first kind of fear, Freud tells us that it is intimately related to sexual restraint, a fact, as he tells us, which is admitted by doctors generally, even by those who are opposed to analysis. But whereas the latter would probably be inclined to say that such persons are predisposed to apprehensiveness,

* *Introduction to the Psychology of Religion*, p. 56.
† *The Rule of Conscience*, chap. vi., rule 5.
‡ *Ibid.*, rule 2.
§ *Op. cit.*, p. 322 (English translation).

and consequently practise sexual limitation, Freud maintains that the reverse is the case. The anxiety is the *result* of the sexual limitation. The reason for this, he holds, is obscure, but a long clinical experience has made him feel quite certain about it. Especially, he tells us, is the practice of *coitus interruptus* a very common source of anxiety in men, and still more so in women.

The other kind of fear Freud thinks he can explain. He tells us that any repression will normally issue in anxiety. To quote his own statement, "Anxiety is thus general current coin for which all the affects are exchanged."* The truth of this is borne out by two sets of phenomena. First, where we have what is called "an obsessional neurosis," we find no anxiety, and we are therefore entitled to suppose that this is because the fear is replaced by the symptoms, such replacement of emotions by symptoms being a well-attested fact. Secondly, the study of anxiety in children points in the same direction. The really remarkable thing about children is that they are not frightened by the proper things, so to speak. The child will climb on to the window sill, or run along the edge of water, or play with dangerous things like knives, without the slightest fear. But of the one thing of which it is most afraid of all, it can be said that it is not dangerous in the smallest degree—the dark. Freud has an ingenious theory to account for this. He holds, as is well known, that the first object of longing in the child is for the mother. When the child is left by her at night, and is in the dark, the longing *in* the dark is transformed into a fear of the dark. In other words, fear of the dark, and *mutatis mutandis* other phobias, arise from the failure to satisfy *libido* or, to use Jung's expression, psychic energy.

Can we, then, apply all this to the fear which is characteristic of scrupulosity? It is worth noting at the outset that there are two kinds of scrupulosity: there is a general scrupulosity regarding everything in general and nothing in particular, and there is, of course, a scrupulosity concerning particular actions. We cannot fail to be struck by the exact parallel which there is here with anxiety generally; and we may, therefore, feel the more confidence that we shall be able to trace a relationship between them.

The crucial question which faces us, in connection with scrupulosity, is, of course, why the anxiety should take the particular form it does. Now, if we consider attentively the case of the scrupulous person, surely the most striking characteristic about him is that, although he will say that he is tormented with a sense of his unworthiness, he is at the same time

* *Op. cit.*, p. 337.

obstinate and self-opinionated on this very point. He will not listen to the advice of his confessor; and the example of the saints, if it is put before him with a view to quieting his conscience, he holds of little account. There is plainly something very egoistic here. Why this strange contradiction? It may perhaps afford us a clue to the understanding of the disease.

If it is true that anxiety is always due to repressed *libido*, or psychic energy, then it would seem that in this case what is repressed is his egoistic instinct. This would explain why he is at once depressed and self-opinionated. He is depressed because circumstances have repressed that instinct, but the latter finds an indirect outlet in his being opinionated and obstinate on this one point. In this way, which is so well known to psychotherapists, both sides of the conflict find satisfaction.

The scrupulous person, then, is suffering from wounded pride (very likely from a long-standing wound), but, of course, of this he is entirely unaware. The penitent may not be actually what would ordinarily be called neurotic; or, on the other hand, he may unmistakably be suffering from a neurosis like Fr. Raymond's penitent, who feverishly filled twelve copybooks with an account of his sins.*

If this is a correct diagnosis of scrupulosity, what must be the treatment? In this connection let us say two things. First, we may suspect some irregularity in the penitent's sexual life, such as *coitus interruptus*, especially if the scrupulosity is of the general variety. In some cases it may be possible to question on this matter, but clearly not in all. Secondly, we have somehow got to cure the penitent of his egoism, of which he is totally unaware. It would seem that this can best be done by impressing him with a sense of God's love for him. He will be encouraged by the priest to meditate on the love of God, to make acts of love and the like, especially, perhaps, with the aid of a crucifix. In all of these ways the priest will assist the sublimation of the emotion which is unconsciously fixed on the penitent's self, instead of on God. Above all, the priest will attempt to get him to *do* something for the love of God. As Jeremy Taylor says, "This is the right course in the matter of a scruple; proceed to action."† If he can be delivered from himself, the problem will be solved, but in no other way. It is, therefore, a sure instinct which has guided the great confessors to counsel that all forms of mortification are to be avoided in the case of the scrupulous. We can now see that the reason for this is that they tend to minister to spiritual pride. But in all forms of outer activity we are likely to get away from ourselves.

L. DEWAR.

* Quoted in Belton, *Manual for Confessors*, p. 221.

† *Loc. cit.*, rule 2.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE series of articles from Professor Goudge, of which we publish the second instalment in this number, has a close bearing on the theme discussed by the Archbishop of Canterbury at the Church Congress last month. There are, of course, other aspects of the matter which have been duly emphasized in the public press; but the old Roman orator's advice, *rem tene: verba sequentur*, is still as true as it was. The *res* in the case of the Christian preacher is the Gospel; and Dr. Goudge's purpose is to show what this was and is, and how it may still be presented to society.

The other aspects to which we have alluded are amusingly illustrated in Canon Lyttelton's recently published *Memories and Hopes*, pp. 286-291. "One hears (he writes) of a rustic congregation avowing a preference for 't'ould Vicar' as against his successor, who was a first-rate, very simple preacher. 'Yees, he's all very good, and I knaws it; but, bless ye, t'ould one was what we loiked—we did.' But that 'ould one' was given to quoting sentences of the Greek Testament in the original—it was a College living—and not one syllable was understood, or expected to be, by any man, woman, or child gathered within the walls."

Perhaps the truth is that what the congregation care about is understanding the man rather than the sermon.

Canon Lyttelton's book abounds in charming glimpses of great personalities: Temple, Sidgwick, Gladstone, Scott Holland are all here. But none is more telling than the picture of the Eton dame, Miss Evans. The impression made on the present writer when he breakfasted with her as a boy was no other than that which those in her House had felt thirty years before. "A peace of mind unbroken by failure," and combined with a rich gift of humour, was the secret of her spiritual influence. And yet she "never mentioned religion."

But the book must be read for itself. Few who read chapter xv. on Whitelands College will have any doubt that the Church Assembly was abundantly right when it decided recently to raise a large loan for this fine Training College. Short as the chapter is, one feels, and the author means one to feel, that here is one of the mainsprings of spiritual life in England.

Dr. Guillaume in the series which we begin this month is at grips with one of the most difficult and yet fascinating of biblical problems. The passages discussed are, as he says, "the keystone of the early Christian position"; and the unfolding of the study of them by so fine an Oriental scholar as Dr. Guillaume will be followed with unusual interest.

Among other contributors to this issue, the Rev. Lindsay Dewar is Warden of St. Anselm's Hall, Manchester. Dr. Paul Levertoff, who reviews Kittel's fine work on Israelite history, graduated at the University of Petrograd, has been sub-warden of St. Deiniol's Library at Hawarden, and is now Director of Work among the Jews in East London. His charming little book entitled *Love and the Messianic Age* will be reviewed shortly in these columns.

We have received the following from the Rev. V. Weston, brother of the late Bishop of Zanzibar. The point seems to us to deserve consideration.

"It has occurred to me, as an argument against the Delff theory of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, that had there been a John who was 'the disciple whom Jesus loved,' and who lay on His bosom at the Last Supper, other than the son of Zebedee, he would have had an indisputable claim to fill the place in the Apostolic Band left vacant by the apostasy and death of Judas Iscariot.

"Can we imagine a disciple so favoured, and of such outstanding spirituality and genius, being passed over in favour of Barsabas and Matthias, and not even mentioned in connection with the vacancy ?"

DOCUMENTS

THE OLD CATHOLICS AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

We are able to publish two further documents on this subject which have recently been received by the Archbishop of Canterbury:

1. A copy of two Resolutions passed by the Tenth International Congress of Old Catholics at Berne, 1925; and
2. The statement of the Conference of Old Catholic Bishops.

Resolutions of the Tenth International Congress of Old Catholics, Berne, 1925, as Regards Relations with the Church of England.

1. The Congress is glad to be able to state that friendly relations with the Church of England have been renewed. The question as regards the Apostolic Succession does not hinder a closer contact of both Churches, as the Church of England did not wish to interrupt that succession. The ordinal of King Edward VI. can be accepted as a valid rite of ordination.

2. The Congress requests the supreme ecclesiastical authorities of all Old Catholic Churches to pass a general resolution regarding the validity of the Anglican rite of ordination.

Statement of the Conference of Old Catholic Bishops Regarding the Validity of Anglican Orders.

The Conference of Old Catholic Bishops united in the Convention of Utrecht, assembled in their session of September 2, 1925, at Berne, in taking notice of the acceptance of the Orders of the Church of England by the Church of Utrecht, fully stands to that decision, which corresponds to former declarations made by Old Catholic Bishops and savants of Germany and Switzer-

land, and gives expression to the fervent hope of a future more intimate and powerful contact with the Church of England and her daughter Churches on a truly Catholic basis.

By order of the Secretary of the Conference.

(*Signed*) Bishop Adolf Küry, D.D.

Berne, *September* 2, 1925.

NOTES

BOOKS ON SPIRITUAL HEALING

We are greatly indebted to the Rev. J. R. Pridie for kindly drawing up the following list of books, in answer to the request of a reader in Canada.

A. *Directly:*

Report of the Lambeth Committee, 1923. S.P.C.K. 6d.

Body and Soul. Dr. P. Dearmer. Pitmans. 3s. 6d.
Historical and explanatory. Full references to early authorities.

Divine Healing. Dr. Pakenham Walsh. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.
A narrative of personal practice and experience.

Health and Religion. Rev. C. O'Flaherty, M.B. Hodder and Stoughton. 5s. Sacramental.

Spiritual Healing. Rev. H. Anson. University of London Press. 3s. 6d. States the *Guild of Health* position.

Anointing of the Sick. Fr. Puller. Longmans. 3s. 6d.
Historical. The classic work on this subject.

Heal the Sick. J. M. Hickson. 7s. 6d.
A narrative of personal experience and work.

The Spiritual Gifts. Rev. J. R. Pridie. Robert Scott. 5s.
An examination into the meaning and place of the charismatic gifts in the permanent equipment of the Church.

Redemption from this World. Professor A. C. Hogge. T. and T. Clark. 8s.
A constructive investigation of the supernatural background of life.

Psychology and the Christian Life. Canon T. W. Pym. Student Christian Movement. 2s. 6d.

Christian Experience and Psychological Processes. Rouse and Crichton Miller. Student Christian Movement. 2s. 6d.
Two "popular" expositions.

All the above are on the positive or affirmative side.

See also articles from time to time in the *S. Raphael Quarterly* and the *Guild of Health* (monthly) *Magazine.*

B. *On the other side should be read:*

Psychology and Morals. D. J. A. Hadfield. Methuen. 6s.

Miracles and the New Psychology. E. R. Micklem. Oxford University Press. 7s. 6d.

Healing. Rev. M. R. Newbolt. S.P.C.K. 2s.

Hibbert Journal. April, 1925. Article by the Bishop of Durham. 2s. 6d.

C. *For general reading, indirectly bearing on the question:*

Psychology of Religious Consciousness. Pratt. Macmillan. 12s.
A very valuable treatise (American); should be read in conjunction with Wm. James' *Varieties of Religious Experience.*

Social Psychology. McDougall. Methuen. 3s. 6d.
Valuable teaching on the "herd instinct" (but recently challenged by psychologists).

Suggestion and Mental Analysis. Dr. William Brown. University of London Press. 3s. 6d.
An exposition of the two great methods of psycho-therapy.

Man's Unconscious Conflict. Wilfrid Lay. Kegan Paul. 10s. 6d.
An account of the Freudian theory.

Miracle and its Philosophical Presuppositions. F. R. Tennant. Cambridge University Press. 4s. 6d.
A critical examination of philosophical and "pseudo-scientific" objections to miracles.

Dr. Rivers' (Cambridge) works are all extremely valuable, especially *Medicine, Magic and Religion.* Kegan Paul. International Library.

THE TRANSFIGURATION

THIS incident stands in almost an identical context in St. Matthew and St. Mark; in St. Luke the parallel is close; in all three there is the definite connection with St. Peter's confession at Cæsarea Philippi. That confession, made in the presence of the Twelve, was accepted, with a strict injunction that "they should tell no man of him." Then all three Evangelists record a clear prediction by Our Lord of His Passion. A period of about a week follows; during this time it would appear from St. Matthew and St. Mark that Our Lord was familiarizing the disciples with the thought of what lay ahead of Him ("And he began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer . . .", Mark viii. 31; Matt. xvi. 21), and giving some indication of the cost of discipleship to the multitude as well (Matt. xvi. 24 *ff.*; Mark viii. 34 *ff.*; Luke ix. 23 *ff.*).

It was a critical time, both for the loyalty and the understanding of the disciples. Their loyalty stood the test; but they did not yet fully understand the meaning of what their Master had said. Their idea of His Messiahship, which had grown up gradually and naturally, had received a rude shock at the mention of His Passion. Then came the Transfiguration, witnessed only by St. Peter, St. James, and St. John. Latham classes this among the miracles of instruction, together with the walking on the sea, the curse on the barren fig-tree, the feeding of the five thousand (*Pastor Pastorum.*, p. 91). He maintains that it was foretold in St. Mark ix. 1. Be that as it may, it cannot be thought that things could ever be the same

as before with the three disciples. Nothing could obliterate from their minds the memory of that radiant scene.

Recently in these pages (THEOLOGY, August, 1925, pp. 86-92) the theory of the late Professor F. Godet was advocated. According to this theory the significance of the Transfiguration was that then and there Our Lord refused to accept the offer to tread the short and easy path of translation to the heavenly sphere. The theory seems to lift the incident out of the sphere of spiritual experience and to base it upon a kind of mechanical necessity. It rests upon two principles, which, briefly stated, are (1) that translation, not death, is the normal end to the earthly life of a sinless man; (2) that God is just, and would not refuse to offer to His Son what was His due as the reward of a sinless human life.

The first of these principles would seem to depend on a very precarious hypothesis. The translations of Enoch, of Moses, of Elijah are regarded as "sporadic survivals of that law which was originally, and should have remained, the great law of human life." Is it legitimate to postulate the existence of a law from such isolated instances? If such a law exists, it would be surprising that there are only these instances recorded in the Old Testament. Samuel and Isaiah, for instance, might be reckoned as deserving of translation as Enoch and Elijah; and some, at least, of the Christian saints have shown devotion to the cause of God equally wholehearted. This law, it is further stated, will reappear when the faithful who are alive at the Second Coming of Our Lord will be translated (1 Thess. iv. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 51)—that is, they will experience what has hitherto been denied to men because of sin. Either they will be sinless and so deserving of translation, or the law, working on a large scale, will have the condition which has prevented its working through the ages abrogated. We may well believe that at the Second Advent those who are alive will pass through an unique experience, but scarcely that this experience will be the resumed working of a long-suspended law.

But is it possible to think that an offer of the kind suggested could have been made from the Father to Our Lord? Surely the fact and purpose of the Incarnation preclude the idea. Our Lord's renunciation of His heavenly glory at His birth was made once and for all, and held good until He had completely fulfilled the Father's will—until He had won salvation for mankind (Phil. ii. 7 *f.*, *ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβών . . . καὶ . . . ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου*). It is somewhat arbitrary to divide His earthly life into a period of obedience and a period of atoning activity. The apostolic writers and preachers insist upon the value of the *whole* life culminating in the atoning death (Gal. iv. 4 *ff.*, *ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ . . . ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ*; *cf.* also Rom. v. 19; Acts x. 36 *ff.*). He came to fulfil the Father's will; that was before Him all the time. The devil tried to turn Him from the path of obedience immediately after the Baptism. That is understandable, but can it be seriously maintained that God the Father would make an offer which, if accepted, would frustrate His own purpose? If the results of a possible acceptance of "that glorious and easy path to bliss" are considered, it appears in the light of a temptation from God to Our Lord to leave His work undone. He would have left an example of perfect obedience to His disciples. The three could have preached that, and told of His glorious withdrawal from this world, but they would not have been able to tell men that salvation lay in belief in the Name of Jesus Christ. They could preach a Lord and Master, but not a Saviour.

Further, it is argued that "the glorious change which passed over Our Lord's person and countenance was the indication that the offer was genuine," and that this offer was brought by Moses and Elijah. All three Synoptists agree that the change had taken place before Moses and Elijah appeared! Again, St. Peter may have wanted to detain Moses and Elijah by building the tabernacles as he suggested, but he is actually reported to have said "καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι."

If the theory thus briefly criticized is not satisfactory, what is left as an explanation of the great event of the Transfiguration? The fact that the disciples were commanded to keep silence does not destroy its effect upon themselves any more than the similar command at Cæsarea Philippi altered their convictions about Jesus which St. Peter had just expressed. St. Peter, St. James, and St. John formed an inner group within the Twelve, and were permitted to see and hear more than the others. It is not impossible that they alone were in a fit spiritual condition to receive such a revelation. It cannot be thought of as an attempt to coerce them into belief. They believed already; now they had, as it were, a glimpse into another world. They were permitted to understand something of the mind and purpose of God. Our Lord refused to give a sign to a faithless and perverse generation, to the Pharisees, to His enemies who were determined not to believe. St. Mark vi. 5 goes so far as to state that He *could* not work a sign in the presence of persistent unbelief. To His own He was continually giving signs both by word and act, and in this incident the Church has recognized the illustration of two great principles of the Christian life. The desire of the disciples to remain on the Mount was a type of spiritual selfishness which Our Lord refused to encourage. To remain on the Mount would not have fulfilled God's purpose for the world, however gratifying it might have been for them. The descent to the ordinary life had to be made; and as we know that descent was not made by themselves, Jesus came down with them. They experienced the Divine Companionship; His glorification did not cut Him off from them. It is not fanciful, perhaps, to see in the position of the disciples after the Voice had spoken and the cloud had passed the future position of mankind. They were alone with Jesus: Law and Prophets had disappeared. Henceforth man would come to the Father through Him alone.

But, above all, the episode was significant for Our Lord Himself. He knew what the future held in store. There were three great occasions when He sought close communion with the Father: (1) after His Baptism; (2) before the Transfiguration; (3) in the Garden of Gethsemane. On this occasion St. Luke tells us that He was praying (ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτόν). We do not know what form His prayer took; but we may reverently imagine that it was for strength to carry out God's purpose. It was answered by the manifestation of the Divine glory resting upon Him. This glory was new to Him only as man; it was the glory which He had with the Father before the world was (*cf.* John xvii. 5, and also i. 14). Then came the two great ones of old to speak with Him "of his exodus which he was about to accomplish *at Jerusalem.*" St. Luke does not say "at Jerusalem, *or* then and there on the mount." No new decision was taken: Jesus held to His original purpose, as the word πληροῦν seems to indicate. He was strengthened by this experience, as later by the angelic ministry in the Garden; and in the power of it "He steadfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem."

A. D. F. McKenzie.

THE COSMOS AND GRAHAM DIFFER ABOUT DR. OTTO

"Dr. Otto has owned the truth," the Cosmos said triumphantly; "he owns the 'spirit' has to be 'presupposed.' In other words that the belief is simply made up by Man himself, to magnify his own imaginary importance."

"But you do not understand," Graham protested. "Dr. Otto clearly demonstrates that the spirit of Man cannot be explained by the laws of nature; that the consequences are beyond the power of mere nature to account for. It is a wonderful book *The Idea of the Holy;* it makes a convincing proof of Man's spiritual birth, a birth that begins with the crude belief of savages and culminates in the Christ."

"You are really incorrigible," the Cosmos groaned in despair. "A unit owns to the delusion of Man imagining that he has any life apart from Me, and you actually believe it is a convincing proof that he has in his nature the beginning of a life that is not from Me, a life that develops in its own lines."

"Dr. Otto says," Graham continued (quite unmoved by the contempt of the Cosmos), "that 'we are not completely in the dark as to the meaning of the word predisposition. For in our own awakening and growth to mental and spiritual maturity we trace in ourselves in some sort the evolution by which the seed develops into the tree.' Dr. Otto goes on to say that in the life of Mankind there is the predisposition 'to a religious impulsion, to which incitements from without and pressure from within the mind both contribute. It begins in undirected groping emotions, a seeking and shaping of representations, and goes on to a continual onward striving to generate ideas, till its nature is self-illumined and made clear by an explication of the obscure, *a priori* foundation of thought itself out of which it originated.' Then Dr. Otto says later: 'It is in the last place clear that it is in the Passion and death of Christ that the objects of the strongest religious intuitions are to be sought. . . . The Cross becomes in an absolute sense the mirror of the eternal Father and not of the Father alone—the highest rational interpretation of the holy—but of Holiness itself.'"

"You are the best hand at turning unreality into reality that I have ever heard of," the Cosmos said scornfully. "Dr. Otto clearly shows that Man's spiritual nature is built on nothing but his own belief in himself. Yet you argue about this unreality as if it were a real foundation. You are hopeless, perfectly hopeless."

"You do not understand your own units," Graham answered. "You quote what they say only to put your own construction on it."

"Because I am rational," the Cosmos said with dignity. "I see the truth. You are irrational and make up what you wish to believe."

"I am not making up anything," Graham protested; "I am simply following Dr. Otto's line of argument."

"A line of argument," the Cosmos declared, "that has no reality, but simply ministers to Man's self-importance."

"Poor old Cosmos," Graham said kindly, "you are very useful to Man; it is only natural that you cannot understand him."

The Cosmos sighed, it felt very sad, for the self-importance of its units was beyond its power of lessening or preventing.

At last it said cheerfully:

"I will not grudge Man his fancies; he comes to Me when he dies, fancies and all."

FLORENCE NEVILL.

REVIEWS

THE RELIGION OF THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL. By Dr. Rudolf Kittel. Translated by Caryl Micklem. London: George Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

This work of the veteran O.T. scholar, which is the outcome of lectures delivered by him at the University of Upsala in the spring of 1920, was well worth the trouble of translating into English. In his *History of the People of Israel* he was obliged to treat the religious history in a fragmentary manner within the framework of the particular periods of the general history, but in this book we have a review, in a condensed but readable form, of the development of the religion of Israel from its beginnings to the Christian era.

In general, Kittel presents those results of modern O.T. criticism upon which a consensus of opinion has been attained. He is guarded and reasonable where others are rash.

In the first chapter he describes the religion native to Canaan that the Israelites found awaiting them on entering the Land. The polydemonism of the primeval pre-Semitic inhabitants (which can be traced back into the third, if not the fourth, millennium before Christ) was taken over and developed by the invading Semites. They called the spirits *Baal* and *Baalah*, perhaps already *elim*. Under the influence of the religions of the great neighbouring peoples they changed the worship of demons into the worship of gods. Like the gods Nergal, Nabu, Sin, and others, the *baals*, and perhaps the *elim* also, become gods; and those gods, on the other hand, are also called *baals* and *elim*. This polytheism in Canaan, however, was not of precisely the same kind as elsewhere. Its fundamental type was the worship of Baal, which, although a nature religion, differed from the ordinary nature religions in that Baal was not a natural force or an expression of nature personally conceived, such as the lightning, the sun, or the moon. In conformity with his origin from the earth spirits and the water spirits Baal is the possessor and owner of a place, or of an object. The Baal Tamar, for instance (*cf.* Judges xx. 33), was not the palm-tree personified, but the baal *in* it. The sun-baal was the lord and master of the sun, who directed it in its course. The baal of the heavens is he who rules in the heavens and who, at the same time, dwells there.

The primitive polytheism takes on either the form of monolatry or that of *monarchic* polytheism. The former, when in a particular circle one definite god seems to tower above

the others to such a degree that for his worshippers he becomes simply "*the* god," "*the* baal," and consequently God absolutely. The latter, when a chief god was raised above the others. This Kittel considers the first step towards monotheism, especially among a thoughtful minority. The plural form *ilani* was construed among such with the singular of the predicate or of the attribute.

Then the patriarchal and desert periods are dealt with. "Israel did not rise from the soil at a stamp of Moses' foot; it must have had a previous history," and Kittel does not doubt the accuracy of the O.T. tradition concerning the previous sojourn of Israel in Canaan. The apparent inconsistency between the one God of the patriarchs in the tradition of the Moses Saga and the plurality of gods recorded in other parts of the O.T. disappears in so far as the dominant tradition specifically recognizes the *el*-worship. If, from time to time, we find references to other gods, the meaning is simply that individuals within the patriarchal circle and its immediate vicinity still paid homage to other gods. In any case, whilst among the other Semitic inhabitants of Canaan, as well as in Babylon, Baal seemed to have stood out as the central figure of worship, the early Hebrews, in pre-Mosaic times, rejected Baal, and confined themselves to *el*. They formed, it seems, a group within the population of Canaan which differed in this point from the predominant mass of those who had been settled there for a longer period.

By the "God of our fathers" of the Moses Saga we must understand, therefore, that *el*-deity, worshipped sometimes as *el 'olam*, who, as He had existed always, would also exist throughout eternity; sometimes as *el shaddai*, the "almighty one"; *hai*, the "living one"; and even the *elyon*, the "most high," towering above the other *elim*, whose existence was not denied. Notwithstanding the fact that we find in the O.T. unmistakable traces of an ancient belief in spirits and demons (Oboth, Azazel), the Bedouin theory of Robertson Smith and others must be given up. The religion of the patriarchal period was not polydemonistic, but a refined monolatry.

Moses and the principal facts of the tradition concerning the Exodus are accepted as belonging to strict history: "Were Moses not an historical figure, another would have to be invented." He accepts Söderblom's definition of the religion of Moses as the "religion of natural emotion." The patriarchs knew a God for whom their most exalted expression was *el elyon*, "Creator of heaven and earth," but who, in other respects, was represented as a kindly guide and helper of His people. But now, in the burning bush, amid the storms of Sinai, and

amid the welter of appalling natural phenomena, Moses became acquainted with a God who was Himself a consuming fire and a "mighty, jealous God," one "who possesses wild and terrifying traits," a God who masters the soul and overpowers it with emotion. Moses was laid hold of by Him and became His prophet, not only in name, but in fact; not an ecstatic prophet, but a man of spiritual insight and of action.

The crossing of the Red Sea is founded upon good historical evidence (Exod. xv. 21). Moses' mission as a prophet received thereby its seal. "The heart that had once been overwhelmed with emotion in the presence of nature was now overwhelmed by the redeeming act. The prophet became the founder of a faith, the originator of an historic religion. History became revelation, and the revelation was ratified in the experiences of history. God, so far from being a mere force within nature, became the one who ruled over nature." There is no reason to dispute Moses' initial stimulus to the laws contained in the so-called Book of the Covenant. Jahweh became a God of the moral will, the Jahweh religion became an *ethical* religion. Its worship was not merely monolatry, but, although not as yet the ethical monotheism of the prophets, a national and ethical *henotheism*.

The nature-elements in Jahweh, instead of being overcome by the higher aspect of His being, were associated in Canaan with the nature-elements in Baal, and threatened to submerge the moral and spiritual elements. Thus it was that the popular religion came into being. At the holy Ark in Shilo, among the nomadic southern tribes and under the leadership of such persons as Deborah, Samuel, David, Solomon, Nathan, and Ahia, and writers like the Jahwist and Elohist, the higher religion in the spirit of Moses was developed. Some circles there were always which outgrew the popular religion, "and this spiritual upper class, a minority, constituted a leaven in the nation." Sin was once again, as with Moses, a religious matter, and God an ethical concept. This paved the way for the great prophets.

Ecstatic *nebiism* probably had its roots, in the north, in Thrace and Asia Minor, and entered in Israel into a peculiar alliance with the long-established functions of the *seers*. "It was the germ from which, in the course of time, there emerged the greatest development of the religion of Israel."

The message of the prophets was based upon a few but great premises. Jahweh was God of gods and peoples—that implied unqualified monotheism and universalism. Jahweh was a God of righteousness and holiness—that implied ethical monotheism. The personal, religious significance of the

individual life was apprehended with increasing clearness—that implied religious individualism. The prophets were against the cultus which sunk to the level of a nature-religion, but they did not repudiate it altogether. In so far as prophetism did not part company with the ethically indifferent nature-principle of the ecstatic *nebiism*, and thus promoted the diffusion of the primitive conceptions of the popular religion, it was stigmatized by them as *false* prophecy.

In Amos we find the first trace of international law in history. The sorrow over his wife's unfaithfulness made Hosea the prophet of the divine love. Isaiah first introduced the conception of faith, "which is the very heart of all higher religions." As a poet, Nahum forgets the proper function of the prophet. Kittel suggests that he was rather a disciple of the old popular prophets than of his great forerunners and contemporaries—"a proof that in these circles, too, there might arise men of lofty spirit and impressive speech."

The Rechabites and Nazarites, the fellow-combatants with the prophets in their struggle against Baal, probably originated from a kind of free military association intended to carry on holy wars in the name of Jahweh.

The revival of the popular religion under Manasseh received a deadly blow in the reforms of Josiah, due to the influence of Jeremiah and the Deuteronomic circle. But the danger of externalization was not yet stamped out. On the contrary, with the emphasis laid in Deuteronomy on Jerusalem as being the only centre of worship, sacrificialism was in danger of becoming the central part of religion. Also the fact that the reform was based upon a book meant that in principle "ancient Israel was buried and Judaism instituted."

In Esra's "Book of the Law" this becomes apparent. It was a pure national religion with a sublimated and profounder idea of God. From the crest of the wave the prophetic notions which pointed the way to a world-religion sank into the under-current. The main current was the legal. The service of Judaism after the time of Esra lay in this, that it did keep alive, although in an imperfect form, these prophetic ideals.

The unequal struggle against Antioch IV. and Hellenization was ended by the triumph of legalism (the Maccabees, Sirach, the Hasidim, and the Pharisees). Esra's desire was fulfilled, and it brought forth its fruit. On the other hand, the old prophetic ideals are revived again; circles who were "emancipated from the Law" uttered warnings against valuing the cultus too highly (*cf.* Ps. l., li.); teachers of wisdom (Book of Job, Proverbs, etc.) pointed men first and above all to God, yet without the high ethical exaltation of the prophets;

apocalyptists (Book of Enoch, Daniel, Psalms of Solomon, etc.) preached the Messianic universal kingdom, yet without the moral pathos of the prophets and without drawing out the eschatological conceptions from among the shadows of legalism; a noble army of those "who were looking for redemption" were at hand, as soon as the Messiah should appear. In Jesus the O.T. is summed up; the Messianic hope fulfilled.

Those who have themselves attempted to condense the result of half a century's highly specialized investigations into a form unburdened with professional technicalities will understand the enormous difficulties with which such a work as Kittel's has had to contend, and will appreciate the manner in which he has triumphed over them. Yet some of his conclusions seem to us wider than his premises. It is very doubtful, for instance, whether we can deduce the first step towards monotheism in pre-Mosaic times from the construction of the plural *ilani*. This plural belongs, like similar plurals in the O.T., to the so-called majestic plurals. On the other hand, is it not probable that the monotheistic reform of Amenophis IV. was due to foreign influence? It is rather remarkable that it took place just at a time when the Habiru emigrated into Egypt proper.

The differentiation between *Baal*-worship and *el*-worship in Canaan is not clearly delineated. It is significant that the O.T. only knows of *el*-worship in prehistoric *Israel*, and of *Baal*-worship among the Canaanites. The oldest witness of the *el*-cult in Canaan, Atanahili, was a worshipper of *Nergal*, which shows its connection with Babylon.

The description of the "wild, terrifying traits" of the "God of the desert," again, is overdrawn, and there is as little reason for ascribing the sense of personal relationship with God in Israel to stimulus from Asia Minor, Thrace, or Canaan (p. 120), as there is for the derivation of St. Paul's or St. John's "mysticism" from the Mystery-Religions.

Perhaps in a new edition Kittel might add a constructive chapter on the O.T. revelation from the objective, dogmatic point of view. The question still remains, How is it that a people which from Kittel's own presentation tended instinctively towards nature-worship, just like the surrounding nations, should have developed such an ethical monotheism; a people so particularistic and exclusive could give to the world the idea of the kingdom of God which would include all nations of the earth (Isa. xix. 24); and a people so eminently inclined towards formalism and legalism should have enshrined the glorious Messianic Hope?

PAUL P. LEVERTOFF.

NOTICES

In Defence of Christian Prayer: A Consideration of some of the Intellectual Difficulties that Surround Petition. By E. J. Bicknell, D.D. Longmans. 1925. 3s. 6d. cloth, 2s. 6d. paper covers.

Though small, this is a notable book—one that is likely to remain for no inconsiderable time the most adequate condensed treatment of a great and difficult subject. Not a few of the difficulties which Dr. Bicknell discusses for the benefit of thinking Christians of our day were felt acutely by the heathen philosophers of antiquity, and were dealt with in much the same spirit by Origen for the benefit of his friends Ambrosius and Tatiana, in his beautiful and helpful treatise *On Prayer*, which ought to be translated.

As might be expected from a great man, the book shows a thorough grasp of philosophical principles, and is remarkably well informed as to the latest developments in psychology, biology, and physical science.

Dr. Bicknell is prepared to give modern psychology its due—perhaps sometimes a little more; but he is inflexibly opposed to the extravagant claim of certain psychologists to treat philosophy and theology as mere annexes or departments of psychology. Psychology, he insists, cannot speak the final word upon the efficacy of Christian prayer. A Christian prays because he believes (explicitly or implicitly) in a certain theory of the relation of God to the universe. Whether this theory is true or not is a metaphysical, not a psychological, question, and in the end must be determined by metaphysical considerations.

In the sixth chapter there is a judicious discussion of the well-known theories of Dr. Rudolf Otto. In agreement with him Dr. Bicknell maintains that a certain vague, inchoate, and as yet undifferentiated awareness of God is primitive and instinctive in the normal human mind—quite as much so as awareness of the external world, and of the existence of other persons. "Knowledge of God does not begin with speculation: it begins, as all knowledge begins, with feeling in the presence of an object. . . . A knowledge of God was implicit in man's original undifferentiated experience, side by side with a knowledge of the external world, and of himself, and of other selves. . . . The 'numinous' [religious] sense is a normal part of man's nature, which has to be accepted as such."

The book is not written for the expert psychologist or philosopher (though such may read it with interest and profit), but for the ordinary educated man or woman. It is the first of a series of cheap philosophical and apologetic works planned by the Literature Committee of the English Church Union. We congratulate the Union on this excellent beginning, and hope that subsequent volumes will reach its high standard. The book is well adapted for study-circle use, and we hope that it will be largely used by the study-circles organized by the Student Christian Movement, as well as by those of the English Church Union. Its message is for all Christians.

Charles Harris.

The Problem of the Future Life. By A. H. McNeile, D.D. Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons. 3s. 6d. net.

This book consists of the Moorhouse Lectures delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral, Melbourne, in the May of this year.

The Lectureship was founded in 1906 by the first Archbishop of Melbourne in memory of the Australian Episcopate of Dr. Moorhouse, one of his predecessors in the See. Its object is to encourage study amongst the Australian clergy, and to offer a standard of intellectual attainment to which they may aspire. With the exception of Dr. Headlam in 1914, and Dr. McNeile in 1925, the Lecturers have all been drawn from the ranks of the Australian bishops and clergy.

It is needless to say that Dr. McNeile's Lectures are marked by the attractive literary style always found in what comes from his pen.

The main divisions of the book are (*a*) Arguments for Immortality; (*b*) those who are being saved; (*c*) those who are being lost. To each of these we devote a brief summary and review. The keynote of the whole is sounded in the Preface, which protests against the separation of the earthly and heavenly life into two compartments. Whatever the future life is to be we are beginning to live it now. There is a reverent reticence in the book which refuses to dogmatize, and Dr. McNeile comes to the conclusion that in his second division we can reach only strong probabilities, and in his third no certain conclusions at all.

On the general question of immortality, Dr. McNeile urges that we should carefully preserve a sharp distinction between the idea of the soul's survival of bodily death and the idea of the impossibility of its ever ceasing to be.

He devotes one chapter to Spiritualism, and sums up his conclusions in these words: "Spiritualism as a proof of life after death is unnecessary; as a source of higher knowledge of the life with God it is unsatisfying; as the real explanation of the phenomena it is uncertain; and for mediums and enquirers alike it is unsafe."

We feel it is not possible in the brief space allotted to this review to give a summary of Dr. McNeile's arguments on the main subject of his lectures. For this purpose we must refer our readers to the book itself, assuring them of the value of all which is written, its faithfulness to Scripture teaching, its recognition of the place of symbolism and Eastern imagery in much about the Future Life which is contained in the New Testament, and its constant insistence upon the consequences of conduct in this life as determining everything in the future one. A few definitions are extracted and summarized.

On Prayers for the Departed we read: "It is clearly as paramount a duty to pray for them as to pray for men and women on earth."

On the subject of the Resurrection body Dr. McNeile writes: "Apart from two doubtful sentences, there is not a word in the New Testament which teaches that the risen body is the actual body that was buried."

On the subject of those who are being lost, he finds it impossible to speak with definiteness. His last words sum up the arguments of many pages of the book: "We must be humble enough to leave the problem in the hands of the God of love and righteousness, believing we shall learn the answer when we know as we are known."

Let no one suppose that this final negative conclusion robs a most interesting book of its value to guide faith and hope. Where the truth is clear, Dr. McNeile's words have neither timidity nor reserve. Where all is uncertain and doubtful, he takes his stand in that reticence which is the surest evidence of reverence for divine things.

HENRY LOWTHER CLARKE (*Bishop*).

THE VALUES OF THE SACRAMENT. By the Rev. W. G. Peck. The Faith Press. 1923. 6s.

The present intensification of Eucharistic controversy renders it a suitable occasion to draw the attention of the readers of THEOLOGY to Mr. Peck's book. The present writer had hoped to review this at length, but unforeseen circumstances have rendered it impossible for him to do so, and he can only tender to the author his apologies for thus delaying a notice of his book.

Mr. Peck calls his book an essay in reconstruction. It is in effect a sustained argument for the view that modern evangelical thought unduly depreciates the importance of the Eucharist, and that if such thought would cut deeper and rid itself of prejudice, it would find in Eucharistic worship a very special relevance to its needs and ideals. It is possible to criticize Mr. Peck's discussion on the ground that he sometimes appears to exalt subsidiary points in Eucharistic thought, but the more one studies his work the more probable does it seem that his emphasis is necessary at least by way of reaction. Those who are concerned to deal with the embittered and vulgar superficialities which are doing duty as "Liberal Protestant" criticism of traditional Eucharistic devotion will gain much from what Mr. Peck has to say, and this is very specially the case in regard to the *cultus* of the Reserved Sacrament.

One further point deserves mention. Most Anglo-Catholic theologians would disagree with Mr. Peck's views on the Ministry. All would do well to consider these views. Aware as the present writer is of grave disagreement, he is still more aware that this disagreement is far less fundamental than might be expected. He would be concerned to argue that Mr. Peck omits certain considerations rather than to attack the premises employed.

WILL SPENS.

THE SACRAMENTARY. HISTORICAL AND LITURGICAL NOTES ON THE ROMAN MISSAL. By Ildefonso Schuster. Translated from the Italian by Arthur Levelis Marke. Vol. I. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 15s.

The translator has provided English readers with an excellent version of an important book written by the Abbot of the monastery of St. Paul's without the Walls, and published in 1919. The Roman Missal in its entirety represents, for the author, "the loftiest and most important work in ecclesiastical literature," and he sets forth the fruit of his daily meditation upon it, and upon the prayers to be recited by bishop or priest in the administration of the other sacraments, in what he very modestly terms "these hasty notes." The work falls into two parts, the former treating of the general conceptions of sacred liturgy, the latter providing extensive notes on the liturgy from Advent to Septuagesima, together with three prefatory chapters on early Christian worship at Rome, the Roman calendar, and the origin and evolution of the Ordinarium Missæ.

While the whole volume contains matter of great value for the student of the Roman rite and of much interest to the general reader, attention may conveniently be restricted in this short notice to a few points of special importance from the Anglican point of view, points in which the author's frankness is seen to equal his full equipment of learning.

It is plainly stated that "far into the Middle Ages the people were still admitted to Communion under both kinds." For reasons of con-

venience, and because it involved less risk of profanation, Communion in one kind has practically become the traditional custom of the Latin Church. No criticism of this change is offered, but neither is there any attempt to argue the sufficiency of these reasons.

It is contended that the traditional place for the epiclesis is "before the account of the Last Supper," and that the later addition of a second invocation intended "to obtain thereby the effective participation of the faithful in the eucharistic feast" led to confusion and displacement. The author recognizes, none the less, that "although the pre-consecratory epiclesis in the Roman anaphora is primitive, we cannot say the same of the version in which it has come down to us."

The problem of side-altars is dated back to at least the sixth century; and it is pointed out that "the multiplying of altars sensibly weakened that oneness of idea which had until then pervaded the basilica, co-ordinating all its lines so harmoniously towards the sanctuary." The writer considers, however, that the gain resulting from the later practice of placing chapels in the transept or along the aisles is "so great as to make us almost forget the corresponding æsthetic loss due to the cutting up of the *naos*."

The essential mark of the sacrament of Holy Orders is declared to be "the imposition of hands and the episcopal 'epiclesis.'" "The rest—litanies, anointings, bestowal of outward insignia, etc.—were from the first merely ecclesiastical ceremonies varying in origin and arising at different periods, having as their object the embellishment of the outward sign of the sacrament, and, by means of external things, the explanation of its hidden meaning." Mention of the deaconess is reserved for a later chapter treating of Religious Consecration, where it is, however, fairly recognized that "at the time of the Council of Chalcedon (451) their inaugural benediction was still accompanied in the East with the imposition of hands by the bishop."

The frequent use of the sacrament of penance is attributed largely to monastic fervour. But "the custom of the Church ordained that Lent should be the season especially set apart for confession; later on Christmas and the Rogation Days were made of equal importance with Easter, so that in the Middle Ages the faithful approached the sacrament of penance three or four times a year." It is a grave matter that this wisdom has been so largely departed from.

The postponement of Holy Unction to the last hour of life is definitely termed an "abuse," unknown to the earlier ages, and due to ignorance, tepidity of faith, and to "the superstition which became current about the thirteenth century that a person who had once been anointed with holy oil was no longer at liberty to eat meat, to dance, or to live in the married state."

Such a combination of learning and frankness as is revealed in this book provides the one sure ground of hopefulness for those who realize that to think of reunion in terms of a Church which does not include the Latin Communion is to propose a sadly imperfect and unsatisfying ideal.

O. Hardman.

Esquisse du Mystère de la Foi, suivie de quelques Eclaircissements. Par M. de la Taille, S.J. Paris: Beauchesne. 1924. 8 fr.

Père de la Taille tells elsewhere that until about twenty years ago no theory of the sacrifice of the Mass had ever gained his approval, except

one for which he could find no authority amongst modern theologians. The discovery of a reassuring definition in the Catechism of Peter Canisius encouraged him, however, and he has since been occupied in building up and fortifying this theory with a wealth of learning. It was fully set forth by him in a Latin treatise, entitled *Mysterium Fidei. De augustissimo Corporis et Sanguinis Christi sacrificio atque sacramento Elucidationes I.* (Beauchesne);* it was briefly presented in a paper read at the Summer School of Catholic Studies held at Cambridge in 1922, and subsequently printed in the volume *Catholic Faith in the Holy Eucharist* (Heffer); and it appears again in French, together with various related studies, in the book named above.

It will not be supposed that the author proposes any novel theory. On the contrary, his desire is to recall theologians to the position taken up by St. Thomas Aquinas, so much more satisfactory, as it seems to him, than some of the developments of the last three centuries. "A mon sens, le XIII^e^ siècle et le commencement du XIV^e^ avaient une vue bien plus juste, plus rationnelle et plus scripturaire, du sacrifice (et par suite aussi plus historique), que n'en ont eu les théologiens de la seconde moitié du XVI^e^ siècle, dont dérive en droite ligne l'enseignement théologique de nos jours." Anglicans will note with the greatest interest and satisfaction that Père de la Taille's teaching is a double protest against the idea that the Mass is a daily repetition of the sacrifice of the Cross, and against the idea of the localization of the Presence of Christ within the consecrated Elements: but they will be quite unable to accept his positive statement as agreeing with primitive and scriptural doctrine.

First, as to the sacrifice. "Il faut que la messe soit un sacrifice subordonné, et non coordonné à la Croix." He will have nothing to do with the realists who claim to victimize Christ anew at every Mass, or with the symbolists who are content to see the reality of the Body and Blood vested with a likeness of death, or again with the conditional realists who, standing midway between the other two, discover in the Eucharistic rite a *virtual* slaying of Christ, capable of accomplishment by the words of consecration, if it were not for the fact that the risen Christ is no longer subject to death. For the author it is a question, not of the making of a victim, but of the presence of one. "The Real Presence of Christ," as he stated at Cambridge, "in whatever shape or form, carries with it the sacrificial status inherent in the Lamb that was slain and liveth." But the essential act of sacrifice is the offering; and in this the position taken differs widely from that of our own Church. It is regarded as a comparatively modern illusion that Christ is Himself the offerer at every Mass. His unique oblation is perpetuated by Him through His agent, the Church; and this comes to mean, in the last resort, the priesthood, however unworthily represented. "L'assistance des fidèles peut manquer; il se peut aussi qu'aucune âme pieuse, autre que le célèbrant, ne se soit faite la pourvoyeuse du sacrifice; il se peut enfin que le célébrant lui-même soit sacrilège: du moins, l'Eglise reste, l'Eglise toujours sainte, toujours bien accueillie de Dieu. Et grâce à cette permanence du facteur principal (entre les facteurs humains), l'offrande du corps et du sang de Jésus Christ est toujours agréable à Dieu, même dans les conditions les plus défavorables. La prêtre fût-il non seulement prévaricateur, mais interdit, mais dégradé, mais excommunié, mais séparé de l'Eglise par l'hérésie

* [We hope shortly to publish a review of this immense work. In certain important particulars we differ from the opinions expressed by our reviewer.—Ed.]

formelle, du moment qu'il offre, l'Eglise offre par lui." A gleam of hope appears at one point when St. Paul's words are recalled concerning the privilege of filling up on our part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in our flesh for His Body's sake, which is the Church; but, instead of leading to the conception of the offering of "ourselves, our souls and bodies," under cover of the great Sacrifice, it is made to mean only that the Church—that is, the priest—is empowered to perpetuate that Sacrifice by ritual action.

Against an objection raised by Père d'Alès the author strongly reaffirms his belief that the Angel of the Sacrifice is our Lord Himself, at the head of the angels. "'Per manus sancti Angeli tui'; c'est bien la main des anges, mais dans la main du Christ, de l'Ange souverain." Readers of this journal will remember Dr. G. A. Cooke's letter in April, 1924, in which he stated that "the idea of the Angel's ministry in the Heavenly Temple has its origin in Jewish apocalyptic dreams," and added that "we cannot be thankful enough that our English liturgy is free from this questionable creation of the religious fancy, however hallowed by custom and association."

Then as to the Presence. It is very much to the good that Père de la Taille is found protesting against the idea of a strictly localized Presence of our Lord in the Sacrament. "La présence qu'il a dans le lieu céleste, ou qu'il avait jadis sur terre, consiste dans un rapport entre deux étendues, la sienne propre et celle des corps environnants. . . . Mais telle n'est pas la présence du Corps du Christ sous les espèces ou apparences du pain." But the dogma of transubstantiation being necessarily presupposed, it is beyond the power of even so clear a thinker and writer to convey any sense of satisfaction with the positive side of his protest. "Au lieu de servir à situer la substance," he writes, "elle (l'étendue de la substance du Corps sacré) se trouve entrer en partage de ce que la substance peut lui communiquer en cet ordre d'idée; et comme on ne donne jamais que ce qu'on a, la substance ne donnera à ses propres dimensions qu'une présence tout à fait étrangère aux conditions ordinaires de cette présence locale qu'entraîne la contiguité de deux surfaces, l'une enveloppante, et l'autre enveloppée." The dogma of transubstantiation is so grievous a hindrance that it is impossible to avoid the appearance of mere verbal juggling in any attempt to demonstrate the true nature of the Presence where that dogma is assumed.

It is, of course, contended that the consecration of the bread and wine is effected by the words "This is My Body," "This is My Blood," which are "ours as to the uttering, but His as to the virtue and efficacy which they borrow from His one utterance (and present co-operation)." Whether the epiclesis precedes or follows the formula of consecration, it matters nothing. "L'épiclèse présuppose le sacrifice déjà fait, ayant pour objet d'en demander à Dieu l'acceptation et la ratification (bien qu'en fait cette ratification, ou acceptation, consiste dans la transsubstantiation déjà opérée)." And yet it has just been recognized that we may have an "épiclèse plus précise, demandant en termes propres la transsubstantiation"! Could there be a more hopeless confusion?

Finally, there is a matter on which Père de la Taille writes most unconvincingly. He asserts, as do many others, that our Lord committed Himself to the Cross at the Last Supper, and that the subsequent agony in the garden finds its explanation in the fact that He was now bound. "Il ne lui est plus loisible de se dérober, car il s'est offert: et on ne retire

pas sans sacrilège à Dieu ce qu'on lui a une fois consacré. . . . L'obligation de se laisser tuer, le Christ l'avait contractée librement dans l'oblation eucharistique de son sang." It is a relief to find Abbot Vonier writing, in his recently published *Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist* (p. 143 *f.*), "We need not even consider the Eucharistic sacrifice of the Last Supper as being a final vow of the Son of God to undergo death, a theme beloved of more than one preacher. . . . The institution of the Eucharistic sacrament of the Last Supper was not so much Christ's vow to die, as Christ's anticipated triumph in his death."

O. HARDMAN.

THE GOSPEL AND THE MODERN MIND. By W. R. Matthews, D.D. Macmillan. 7s. 6d.

All who are concerned with the task of educating the rising generation will have reason to be grateful to Dr. Matthews for the genuine sympathy and insight which has enabled him to discern a real "modern mind" behind that bundle of prejudices, conventions, and insolences which the unthinking part of this—as of every other—generation is "pleased to call its mind." The apologist for modern thought not infrequently speaks of it as something so new and glorious that it is independent of, and opposed to, all ancient thought; others are "apologetic" in the derived sense of the word, and make excuses for it, timidly suggesting that if we wait patiently it will pass off. Dr. Matthews is wiser than either of these, "a scribe instructed unto the Kingdom of Heaven bringing forth out of his treasures things new and old." He knows that the modern mind has permanent elements derived from its contact with the eternal mind; and he is confident that the "good news of God" is sufficient to supply the needs of the present as of the past, although it will necessarily be apprehended differently by each generation. He has faith to look on serenely at "the removing of those things that are shaken," being confident "that those things that cannot be shaken" will remain. He welcomes unreservedly all that the modern mind has to bring of scientific training and progress in philosophic thought towards the apprehension of the Gospel, and is at pains to remind us of the distinction between it and theology, as to which he frankly owns his conviction of the need of restatement to make it acceptable to the modern mind. To urge that Dr. Matthews does not show us what new formulas could be devised which would not in their turn grow out of date is to neglect the warning of the Preface not to criticize a book "by pointing out what it does not contain." This book is an essay in popular theology addressed to educated men and women who are not experts in science or philosophy, and aims at showing that the characteristic conceptions of the modern mind are so far from being opposed to the Gospel, that they need it to give them coherence, and that in it they will find the only guide to the solution of the problem presented by the "challenge of the universe."

Dr. Matthews deals with three main characteristic conceptions of the modern mind, which divide it from that of the generation to whom the Gospel was first presented; (1) The idea of continuity in nature, arising from the scientific habit of thought and the historical outlook, which has trained men to look on events as knit together by a necessary order in an organic whole. This involves (2) the conception of a dynamic as opposed to the static ideal, an immanent force rolling on in constant progress.

But over against these two conceptions stands another, specially characteristic of modern philosophy; (3) the conflict between the subjective and objective, between the mind which thinks and the order of nature presented to its thought, involving a moral conflict which is present not only to the philosopher, but to the average thinking man.

The aim of this book is to show that the Gospel presents abiding values reaching to the depths of human nature, which remain the same beneath all the fluctuations in modes of thought and feeling. The Gospel is the good news of the kingdom or rule of God; it is the revelation of the Divine nature and will, manifested in Jesus Christ through a human personality, as the living God, the "inner reality of all existence, the moving Spirit of the world" giving continuity, progress, and value.

H. L. Powell.

BOOK NOTES

SOME RECENT GERMAN BOOKS

Messrs. Hinrichs of Leipzig send us the second edition (1924, 30 M.; first edition, 1920) of Adolf von Harnack's *Marcion: Das Evangelium Vom Fremden Gott*, which now appears in an enlarged and improved form. As the book received a lengthy and very appreciative criticism in our columns when it first appeared, it is sufficient to call attention to it once more, this time congratulating the author and his public on the fact that the first edition of a technical patristic monograph has been sold out in so short a time. No such public awaits the English writer of such books.

A parcel of books also comes from the firm of Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht of Göttingen.

Das Judentum: Geschichtschreibung, Prophetie und Gesetzgebung nach dem Exil (8 M.) belongs to a series which, unlike Lietzmann's Commentaries or the Meyer-series, seems little known here—*Die Schriften des Alten Testaments*. This particular volume is one of remarkable interest and merit. Max Haller, the author, translates and annotates the post-exilic literature, with the exception of the Psalter and Wisdom-literature, which are treated in another volume. All the important passages are arranged in their presumed order. Consecutive reading of the selections gives an impression hardly to be obtained from any English book.

As illustrating current opinion in Germany, the following summary of contents may prove interesting. Ezra i. 1-iv. 5; Isaiah xiii. 1-22, xiv. 4-21, xxi. 1-10, etc. (anticipations of Babylon's fall); Isaiah xl.-lv.; Ezra iv. 24-vi. 22 (the building of the Temple in 520); Haggai; Zechariah i.-viii.; Ezra iv. 6-23; Malachi and Isaiah lvi. to end (illustrating the state of things in the first half of the fifth century, and the eschatological ferment which preceded Ezra); Nehemiah, Ezra, and the second visit of Nehemiah; Leviticus (Ezra's book of the law); the Elephantiné Papyri (treated as equally valuable to us as the Aramaic documents contained in Ezra); Habakkuk (taken as referring to Alexander the Great, Kittim—Greeks—being read for Kasdim, with Duhm); Zechariah ix.-xiv.; Esther; Chronicles.

No better book could be recommended to those who have no time for elaborate commentaries upon individual books of the Old Testament.

Christus-Religion oder philosophische Religion? By Heinrich Matthes. This little book is too German in its outlook to make much appeal to English readers, but it possesses distinct interest as showing the new

currents of thought in German Protestantism. Philosophy and mysticism, which are not specifically Christian, are contrasted with the simple Evangelical faith which rests upon the fact of Christ. "The mystic has a religious experience of that transcendent world which the philosopher creates by his thought-process." Both put Christ in the background. Christianity is shown in its purest form by Paul and Luther. Catholicism believes in "somewhat," Evangelicism in "someone." Otto should have written about "der Heilige" rather than about "das Heilige." Dr. Matthes is a very competent writer, and his reaction from the Kantian philosophy is significant. But when he puts his main question, "The religious Either-Or for this generation"—that is, either philosophy or Christ-religion—he seems to us to make a typically German mistake. Here, as elsewhere in recent German books, we notice the influence of Barth's *Der Römerbrief*, with its insistence on transcendence and the other-worldliness of Christianity.

H. Willrich's *Urkundenfälschung in der hellenistisch-jüdischem Literatur* (M. 5.60) protests against Eduard Meyer's brilliant excursions into a specialist field of knowledge. The writer says emphatically that the documents in the Books of Maccabees and Josephus are not genuine, being forgeries produced for the needs of Jewish apologetic. Josephus makes a show of having consulted archives, for example, those of Tyre for the history of Solomon, when he has merely copied from the Septuagint. The Capitol was burned in A.D. 69, and the old documents, if any, which showed friendship between Rome and the Jews, perished then. Had Josephus seen such documents, he would certainly have boasted of his diligence. Archives existed in the ancient world, but were not as a rule consulted, though Polybius was an exception.

Der Zweite Korintherbrief. By Hans Windisch. M. 15. The well-known Meyer Commentary on this book was published originally in 1840. The eighth edition, by Heinrici, appeared in 1900 and went out of print in 1914. The present (ninth) edition by the extremely able Leiden professor, whose contribution to *The Beginnings of Christianity* has made him known to English readers, will rank for years to come as the most thorough Commentary on the hardest book of the New Testament; its publication is therefore to be warmly welcomed.

Unfortunately for the self-esteem of British scholarship, the chance of our ever being able to rival the best German Commentaries is very small. The scholars who might write the books are absorbed in pastoral or administrative work, the publishers who could issue such huge volumes do not exist, and, most important of all, there is no public for such detailed studies of the minutiæ of interpretation. We must be content to use the best books that exist, which are German, and to a lesser extent French, and to hope that our own New Testament work will be in closer touch with the realities of life, by its avoidance of excessive specialization, as it certainly is more likely to prove helpful to English readers.

While we praise Dr. Windisch's book as the best on its subject and indispensable to advanced students, we are justified in complaining of its inordinate length. Is it really necessary that a Commentary on one short epistle should run to nearly a quarter of a million words ?

We cannot enter into details of exegesis, but Windisch's theory of the Epistle should be given. St. Paul wrote five letters in all to Corinth.

1. The original letter mentioned in 1 Cor. v. 9—"I wrote unto you in my epistle to have no company with fornicators . . ."

2. 1 Corinthians, which deals with problems raised by a letter from Corinth.

3. The letter written " with many tears " (2 Cor. ii. 4), which cannot, as some scholars think, be identified with chapters x.-xiii. This letter was unsuitable for permanent use and so was not copied.

4. 2 Cor. i.-ix., which can *just* be made to fit into a possible framework. There are many difficulties. For example, vii. 5 seems to be the original continuation of ii. 13 (" Taking my leave of them, I went forth into Macedonia. . . . Even when we were come into Macedonia "). Chapters viii. and ix., dealing with " the collection," form an independent " business letter " comparable with the Epistle to Philemon; though viii. and ix. are not obviously connected.

5. If i.-ix. can just possibly be accepted as forming one letter, in x.-xiii. we find a Philippic which is inconceivable after the repentance, fully accepted by St. Paul, of vii. No hint of such a state of mind appears in the earlier chapters. (Lietzmann thought a sleepless night would account for it! But what pastor would thus destroy the effect of the first part of his letter ?) Windisch's theory is in the main original. Chapters x.-xiii. are a fifth letter, written some weeks after i.-ix. Further important news had arrived, or the apostle had visited Corinth. In Acts xx. 3 we read of a three months' stay in *Greece*. This allows time for a visit to Corinth, to which St. Paul would naturally go first, journeys to other centres, and a final visit. The last blow was successful, as the preservation of the letter shows. The important autobiographical details led to its being affixed to the fourth letter.

This theory has one great advantage over that commonly held by English scholars to-day, that x.-xiii. is the letter " with many tears " of ii. 4. Was the Corinthian Church likely to make the course of events unintelligible by inverting the order of the two letters ? Whereas to add a later document to a roll with the requisite space unused was an obvious course; witness our books of Isaiah and Zechariah. If we refuse to follow Windisch all the way and suppose that i.-ix. was sent and immediately afterwards, on the receipt of bad news, x.-xiii. as a kind of postscript, and that the conclusion of the first and beginning of the second were omitted in order to make a book of one roll, we have a theory which meets most of the difficulties and is near enough to the traditional theory to be accepted even by the most conservative scholars.

W. K. L. Clarke.

Thoughts of Blessed Ramón Lull. For every day. Compiled by E. A. Peers. Burns Oates and Washbourne, 2s. 6d. Professor Peers, whose editions of *The Book of the Lover and the Beloved* and *The Art of Contemplation* have been fully reviewed in this journal, now gives us brief thoughts, derived from Lull's various works, for each day of the year. The book is exquisitely got up.

Foundations of Faith. II. Christological. By Rev. W. E. Orchard, D.D. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. 5s. This book is the second part of a series of four volumes, " which will endeavour to cover the whole ground of Christian theology." It contains two very good chapters, that on the Consciousness of Christ, and that on the Doctrine of the Atonement. The rest of the book traverses well-worn paths, as might be expected, and the theological conclusions are those of a sound and sober Catholicism. Dr. Orchard is well equipped to deal with theological

problems in the light of modern thought, and has produced a useful book. There is a long list of acknowledged errata, which might be added to considerably. It must be confessed that the book is rather carelessly written. In one case this heedlessness seems to have affected the theology. Dr. Orchard can hardly mean to refer to the "Person" of Christ as "human and divine" (p. 85).

The Industry of Faith. By P. N. Waggett, D.D. Mowbrays. 5s. To walk with Dr. Waggett is to step in the best of company through a delicate and highly luminous haze. He never fails to make the common things "seem apparelled in celestial light." The bulk of the book is occupied with two courses of Lent sermons, and the general trend of the teaching is to emphasize the conscious and deliberate elements in the Christian life.

St. Peter's Charter, as Peter Read It. By T. H. Passmore. Wells Gardner, Darton and Co. 8s. 6d. *Our Communions.* By T. H. Passmore. Wells Gardner, Darton and Co. 3s. 6d. Mr. Passmore's Euphuism would be more irritating if it were not that he has always something interesting to say. His manner of saying it does his subject less than justice. "St. Peter's Charter" develops with great ability the thesis that St. Peter's primacy and jurisdiction was for a definite series of acts—the foundation of the Church, and the admission of the Gentiles—and came to an equally definite end at a definite moment. After this, *functus officio*, he relapses into the position of *one of the Apostles*. With the main thesis the author combines much that is fanciful and a certain amount that is rather scornfully controversial. There are some striking conjectures elaborated, notably the suggestions that the Apocalypse of St. John was a series of warnings addressed in the first instance to St. Peter, and that the First Epistle of St. Peter is an answer to the Second Epistle of St. John. *Our Communions* is a collection of three sets of addresses, dealing respectively with Holy Communion, Prayer, and the parable of the Unjust Steward.

The Living God: A Devotional Study. By Vernon F. Storr. Hodder and Stoughton. 5s. These are "thoughtful" sermons of a good type. dignified, plain, moderate, scholarly. There is nothing new here, but much to increase a man's confidence in the basic truths of orthodox Christianity.

Christian Social Duty. By John Lee. Student Christian Movement. 5s. "We have drifted into thinking that social duty for the Christian lies in pressing forward Christian legislation." "This external substitution for the monitions of the spirit brings with it such a weakening of the spiritual social stimulus that it does not succeed." We need to think out the principles of a Christian sociology and govern our own lives and businesses by them. A stimulating book, though not very easy to read.

Hints and Helps for Corporate Prayer. By George Steven, D.D. *Some Catholic Methods of Prayer.* By H. L. Hubbard. Student Christian Movement. 1s. each. These are two volumes of a series intended to provide help in the practice of the spiritual life. The former aims at helping inexperienced "leaders in prayer." It should be useful to those who are called to such responsibilities, though it may be doubted whether it is wise for such persons to undertake the delicate task of suggesting in the course of prayer the sin which may have been committed by those whom they are leading. Mr. Hubbard's book deals with his subject from the Anglo-Catholic standpoint, and gives good and simple advice on the methods of mental prayer.

K. D. MACKENZIE.

Now I Know. By J. A. MacCallum. The Macmillan Co. N.Y. 7s. Short chapters on religious faith and experience by an American Liberal.

The Gospel at Corinth. By Richard Roberts, Minister of the American Presbyterian Church in Montreal. The Macmillan Co. N.Y. 8s. A series of exceptionally vigorous expository sermons on the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians by a modern-minded preacher of wide culture—though he does confuse Frankenstein with his monster.

What is Mysticism? By C. M. Addison. The Macmillan Co. N.Y. A very small book, beautifully written and really helpful. Mysticism is a method of approaching God. Its quality depends upon the God who is sought. The mystic desires nothing more than the ordinary Christian should desire, but differs from him in the intensity of his longing. The lesser flights of mysticism are open to all.

The History of Religion in the United States. By H. K. Rowe. The Macmillan Co. N.Y. 8s. In this brief sketch Prof. Rowe describes the three great emancipatory tendencies from State Churches to voluntaryism, from Protestant rigidity to emotionalism, and from Protestant Orthodoxy to liberalism He rightly praises the devotion with which the Atlantic States supported the young churches of the Middle West. "The frontier" was always the dominant feature in American religious idealism. A generation or so ago Americans realized that it had disappeared. Its place is now taken by the imperfectly assimilated elements of the Eastern cities and by the Mission Field. Church membership continues to grow faster than the population, so that religious bodies are increasing relatively as well as absolutely.

The Life of Prayer in the World. By Francis Underhill. Mowbray. 1s. 6d. It is a great pleasure to think of such sermons as these being delivered in English churches. Though preached at All Saints', Margaret Street, they contain hardly a sentence which would not be acceptable in churches of a quite different colour. They deal with the fundamentals of the devout life with great simplicity, common sense and insight.

How to Enjoy the Bible. By Antony C. Deane. Hodder and Stoughton. 2s. 6d. Canon Deane's book is exceedingly attractive and calculated to send many readers back to the Authorized Version. For it is this which he recommends, at least for the New Testament, devoting much of his space to showing its felicities. His own writing, as one would expect, is a model of simple and beautiful English exactly expressing the author's clear thoughts. A characteristic passage may be quoted from p. 45: "In Ruth, that idyll of the harvest field, how exactly the wording of this sentence matches the setting, enhances its simple grace: *The Lord do so to me, and more also, if ought but death part me and thee*—seventeen words, and only eighteen syllables. Try the result of recasting that in longer words, and observe how the tender charm is marred! But no less well did these translators know how to employ sonorous Latinisms when a loftier diction was in better accord with the sense: *Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible. . . .*" Perhaps the author is less satisfying in matters of scholarship. For example, he holds that the Sermon on the Mount was delivered as it stands in St. Matthew, except for the Lord's Prayer (but who could recall a sermon packed so closely with matter?); that St. John wrote chapters xiii.-xvii. of his Gospel on the night of the Crucifixion, to comfort the Blessed Virgin Mary; and that "we may be sure" St. Luke planned a third book.

The Kingdom, the Power and the Glory. Part III. of "A New Prayer Book" (the Grey Book). Oxford University Press. This is of real value

for occasional services of all sorts, family prayers, etc. That any group of Churchmen should seriously put it forward for consideration by Prayer-book revisers must be classed among the curiosities of contemporary Church history. These are some of the subjects for thanksgiving: "For all young and swift and happy things. . . . For bright eyes and lovely bodies. . . . For the glory of God, shining in commonplace lives; for husband and wife scheming to please one another." And we are invited to pray "O Christ, deliver us" "from trivial ideals and cheap [used presumably in the slang sense] pleasures . . . from false piety which cannot laugh," etc. Any Prayerbook revised on these lines would thirty years hence be far more old-fashioned than our present book.

A Manual of Moral Theology. By Thomas Slater, S.J. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 2 vols. 25s. This most useful book has now reached a fifth edition, in which substantial changes have been made to bring it into conformity with the new Codex. We cannot join in the chorus of Anglican depreciation of Roman Moral Theology. For many years works like this will remain indispensable to Anglican clergy. Now, fortunately, Mr. Kirk has provided a key to their use in his *Ignorance, Faith and Conformity*, in which he points out that the Roman Catholic Church has a great law book, the Anglican on the contrary very few laws, but many customs. However much we inculcate the observance of Roman customs, they have no legal authority for us.

Christian Monasticism : A Great Force in History. By Ian C. Hannah. Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d. We strongly recommend this popular sketch of monasticism by the Professor of Church History at Oberlin College. No one could be expected to be at home in the primary authorities for Egyptian, Celtic, and Cistercian monasticism, the Knights Templar, and the Jesuits, to mention but a few of the subjects discussed in this book. But the best secondary authorities are invariably used and admirable sketches of the available literature are appended to each chapter. Prof. Hannah has succeeded in writing a book which should lead many to a more sympathetic appreciation of monasticism and some to a detailed study of one or more parts of this mighty field of knowledge.

The Imitation of Christ. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 5s. "The Orchard Series" has already made its mark. This edition is a slightly modernized form of the translation of Richard Whytford published in 1556. A sentence will give an idea of the style. "And anon he was comforted, and committed himself wholly to the will of God, and all his doubtfulness ceased, and never afterwards would he curiously seek to know what should become of him, but rather he studied to know what was the will of God concerning him, and how he might begin and end all his deeds to the pleasure of God and his honour."

Knowledge of God in Johannine Thought, by M. R. Ely (Macmillan, 6s.), is a useful American thesis dealing with the Johannine idea of *gnosis* on the background of the Old Testament, mystery religions, and syncretistic thought of the first century. The word *gnosis* itself is avoided by the Evangelist, but the concept is fundamental to his thought. It denotes the mystical apprehension of God and, though current language is used, new religious ideas are expressed by the unknown genius who in this Gospel interpreted Jesus to the Greek world.

The Shewings of Lady Julian, by the Rev. Dundas Harford (Allenson, 3s. 6d.), now appears in a third edition. W. K. L. C.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER